

Also, petition of Maple Grove Christian Endeavor Society, of Lagrange, Ind., urging the passage of House bill No. 5457, prohibiting the sale of liquor in Army canteens—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: Petition of representative stockmen, at a meeting held at Yampa, Colo., and Cigar Makers' Union No. 129, of Denver, Colo., relating to the leasing of public lands, etc.—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of Wild County, Colo., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 264, Carpenters and Joiners, of Boulder, Colo., favoring the passage of House bill No. 6882, relating to hours of labor on public works, and House bill No. 5450, for the protection of free labor against prison labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of Pleasantville, Pa., to prohibit the sale of liquor in canteens, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of R. A. Pierce Post, No. 190, and C. L. Chandler Post, No. 143, Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, protest of citizens of Walnut Hill, Mass., against the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of a mass meeting of citizens of Charlestown, Mass., for the construction of gunboats and cruisers in the Charlestown Navy-Yard—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of Post No. 17, Department of Nebraska, Grand Army of the Republic, in support of House bill No. 4742, to provide for the detail of active and retired officers of the Army and Navy to assist in military education in public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Mills and 21 citizens of Beatrice, Nebr., and affidavit of Dr. G. L. Rowe, to accompany House bill for the relief of the said William Mills—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEWART of New Jersey: Resolution of G. R. Paul Post, No. 101, of Westwood, N. J., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SULZER: Resolutions of the Transvaal Committee of California, signed by L. K. P. Van Baggen and others, requesting Congress to take steps for immediate intervention between Great Britain and the South African Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TAWNEY: Petition of citizens of Steele and Dodge counties, Minn., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TERRY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Joseph B. McGahan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Methodist Episcopal Church, and Baptist Church of Busti, N. Y., and Union Grange, of Kennedy, N. Y., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens and at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Resolutions of the Columbus (Ohio) Trades and Labor Assembly, against increase of taxation on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of 55 citizens of Forest City, Pa., favoring the enactment of a clause in the Hawaiian constitution forbidding the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors and a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 10, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. GALLINGER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th ultimo, a statement showing the ages and number of clerks, messengers, etc., in the Department, and also the number of those who are incapacitated for manual

labor, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

SCHOONER POLLY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Polly*, Benjamin Shillabar, master; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

CUSHINGS ISLAND, MAINE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Quartermaster-General relative to a proposed amendment to the Army appropriation bill providing for the purchase of land on Cushings Island, Portland Harbor, Maine, to be used to erect additional batteries and for buildings for the troops thereon; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the concurrent resolution of the Senate to print 14,000 copies of the general summary entitled Review of the World's Commerce for the year 1899.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 77) authorizing the printing of a special edition of the Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture for 1899.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6959) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

A bill (S. 2679) declaring certain trestles of the Washington County Railroad Company to be lawful structures;

A bill (H. R. 60) to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein;

A bill (H. R. 8063) to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River, at Rockport, Miss.;

A bill (H. R. 9284) to attach the county of Foard, in the State of Texas, to the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas and providing that all process issued against defendants residing in said county shall be returned to Fort Worth;

A bill (H. R. 9713) permitting the building of a dam between Coon Rapids and the north limits of the city of Minneapolis, Minn., across the Mississippi River; and

A bill (H. R. 10311) to authorize the Shreveport and Red River Valley Railway Company to build and maintain a railway bridge across Red River at or near the town of Alexandria, in the parish of Rapides, State of Louisiana.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a memorial of the Central Trades and Labor Council of Rochester, N. Y., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation regulating electrical wiring in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Groton, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation requiring the labeling of oleomargarine and all kindred dairy products; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of Sydney Post, No. 41, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, of Ithaca, N. Y., praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to Senate bill No. 1477, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Real Estate Board of Brokers of New York City, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the reduction of stamp-tax duties imposed on mortgages, leases, rent receipts, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Cuba, of the Woman's Christian Temperance

Union of Perry, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Syracuse, and of the congregation of the First Presbyterian Church of Wolcott, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I present a petition of sundry citizens of Vale Summit, Md., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1770, to provide for the acquisition, purchase, construction, and condemnation by the United States of America of all railroads lying in the Territories of the United States, the respective States, and the District of Columbia engaged in interstate commerce in carrying the mails and to provide for the said roads of the United States, and amending the act of Congress of February 4, 1887, entitled "An act to regulate interstate commerce, and for other purposes." I ask that the petition be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Petition for public ownership of railroads, telegraphs, and telephones and for passage of bill No. S. 1770 and against bill No. S. 1439.

To the Congress of the United States:

Whereas the Constitution has reposed in Congress power to regulate interstate commerce and provide for the carriage of the mails, both of which are long likely to be carried by railroads, which are public highways, and their administration of function of government; and

Whereas it is the constitutional right of your petitioners that the foregoing function of government be administered equally and justly to all citizens, that they be not denied the equal protection of the laws; and

Whereas experience has demonstrated the futility of mere regulation to obtain such just and equal treatment from private corporations while they possess the active powers of government inherent in the ownership of such railroads, now, in fact, irresponsible monopolies; but, on the contrary, unjust tolls have long been exacted from many persons and localities, and secret and unjust preferences granted to favored persons and corporations whereby trusts and monopolies have been created and are still sustained to the great injury of innocent persons and the demoralization of the business community, and all this in open defiance of law and the equal principles of our Government, and in the very teeth of both State and Federal regulation, which are powerless to protect the people; and

Whereas such railway monopolies and other consequent trusts tend to corrupt the public conscience, forestall commerce between the States, destroy competition, and confiscate the property of innocent persons by their discriminations and favors; which conditions render it necessary that the Government should acquire the said highways and operate the same as one of its own functions, to secure for its citizens the equal protection of the laws and those equal opportunities to insure which government is ordained, some forty out of fifty nations of the world now operating directly their respective railways free from the great evils of our private system; and

Whereas it is certain that the unification of the railways of this country under Government ownership and operation would secure for the people:

First. The stability of the capital now invested in railways at its just worth.

Second. Its ultimate payment and retirement, and the elimination, thus of one-third of the burdens of commerce, etc.

Third. Absolutely equal treatment to the patrons of the railways.

Fourth. An eight-hour work day for railway employees.

Fifth. A cent a mile passenger fare for the entire country, and penny postage.

Sixth. A better development of the resources of the country, and a just distribution of railway mileage.

Seventh. The establishment of postal express at one-half of present cost.

Eighth. A system of accident insurance for passengers, employees, and shippers.

Ninth. The prevention of strikes and many monopolies, trusts, etc.

Tenth. The emancipation of public men, primaries, and elections from the growing evils of railway politics, and the security of railway employees by a rigid system of merit, tenure, etc.

Therefore, the undersigned, citizens of Vale Summit, Maryland State, respectfully remonstrate against the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, as a further experiment of "regulation," but in fact an act to legalize railway trusts, and do petition Congress to at once enact legislation for Government ownership and operation of railroads, as well as telegraphs and telephones, and to acquire the same at a fair valuation by purchase or condemnation, to the end that equality of opportunity in the use of transportation may be guaranteed to all citizens of the Republic; and we recommend for immediate consideration the pending bill S. 1770, introduced in the Senate by the Hon. Senator RICHARD F. PETTIGREW.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of sundry citizens of Hoffman, Md., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the Government ownership and operation of railroads, as well as telegraphs and telephones, and to acquire the same at a fair valuation by purchase or condemnation, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lempster, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the selling of or dealing in beer, wine, or any intoxicating drinks in any post exchange, or canteens, or transports, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BARD presented a petition of the bar association of Fresno County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to divide the southern judicial district of California into two divisions; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BATE presented a memorial of the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals of New York, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation extending the time for trans-

portation of live stock from one State to another; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TELLER presented the memorial of C. W. Boynton, of Longmont, Colo., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Loud bill, relating to second-class mail matter; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Fort Lupton, of the congregation of the First Baptist Church of Grand Junction, and of the congregation of the Congregational Church of Grand Junction, all in the State of Colorado, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on premises used for military purposes; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the reclassification of clerks in the Railway Mail Service; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Millville, Oxford, Allentown, and Reading; of the congregation of the Baptist Church of Oxford; of the Nottingham Meeting of Friends, of Chester County, and of the congregations of the United Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal churches of Oxford, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in any post exchange, canteen, or transport, or upon any premises used for military purposes by the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FORAKER presented a petition of Mountville Grange, No. 1403, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mountville, Ohio, praying for the election of United States Senators by a popular vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a petition of Mountville Grange, No. 1403, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mountville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure more adequate anti-trust laws; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Fire and Marine Underwriters of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying for the adoption of a certain amendment to the war-revenue law; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Soldiers and Sailors' Department of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Dayton, Ohio, remonstrating against the sale of intoxicating liquors in the newly acquired possessions and in the Army; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Rev. Edwin Sherwood, pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and A. L. Ellis, trustee, of Kingston, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens at Army and Naval Soldiers' Homes, immigrant stations, and Government buildings, and on all grounds and premises used by the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, of Delaware, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in canteens and on all Government property; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Mountville Grange, No. 1403, Patrons of Husbandry, of Mountville, Ohio, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure protection in the use of adulterated food products; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. SEWELL presented a petition of the Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor of the First Presbyterian Church of Metuchen, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in the Army and also in our new island possessions; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Daretown, N. J., and a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of Daretown, N. J., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings and premises; which were referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR presented the memorial of Rev. Joseph H. Johnson, of Los Angeles, Cal., bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, remonstrating against the extension of sovereignty over foreign territory; which was referred to the Committee on the Philippines.

He also presented the memorial of Rev. Edward Everett Hale and sundry other citizens of Massachusetts, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation extending the time for transportation of live stock from one State to another; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Natick, Mass., and a memorial of the Woman's Suffrage League of Natick, Mass., remonstrating against the sale

of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, favoring the enactment of legislation for the establishment of a harbor of refuge upon the eastern shore of Cape Cod; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Woman's Suffrage League of Natick, Mass., and a memorial of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Natick, Mass., remonstrating against the importation, manufacture, and sale of intoxicating liquors in Hawaii; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Joseph J. Corbett, chairman, and James J. Mellen, secretary, of a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Charlestown, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the construction of one or more Government vessels at the Charlestown navy-yard; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3250) to protect the fresh-water mussels in the rivers of the United States, reported adversely thereon; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3119) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Terry; A bill (S. 2729) granting a pension to Eliza L. Reese; A bill (S. 3082) granting a pension to Elizabeth F. Wolfley; and A bill (S. 1126) for the relief of Mrs. Narcissa G. Short.

Mr. LINDSAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Elvira Hunter, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3790) to increase the pension of Anna M. Collier, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4006) granting an increase of pension to Edward M. Tucker; and

A bill (S. 2400) granting an increase of pension to Edith Lockwood Sturdy.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1975) granting a pension to Annie D. M. Wood; and A bill (S. 4030) granting a pension to Helen M. Glenn.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 6731) granting an increase of pension to William F. Tait;

A bill (H. R. 6486) granting an increase of pension to Orange F. Berdan;

A bill (H. R. 4795) granting an increase of pension to John O'Connor;

A bill (H. R. 8397) granting an increase of pension to John White;

A bill (H. R. 3758) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Ricketts; and

A bill (H. R. 3821) granting an increase of pension to Frances D. Best.

Mr. WARREN, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1992) for the relief of Mathias Pederson, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McMILLAN, I am directed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1929) to provide for eliminating certain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company, in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments, and to submit a report thereon.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to this bill and to the report accompanying it. It is a very important bill, and I expect to call it up soon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 4007) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Dunn; and

A bill (H. R. 8599) granting a pension to Ellen J. Williams.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were

referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1569) granting a pension to Mrs. Phebe E. C. Priestly;

A bill (H. R. 3941) granting a pension to Samuel B. Weeks; and

A bill (H. R. 8390) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Mitchell.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3137) granting an increase of pension to Lunsford Ellis, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3436) granting a pension to Carolina Wienhimer; and

A bill (S. 825) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Coons.

Mr. BARD, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8585) to amend an act entitled "An act to prevent forest fires on the public domain," approved February 24, 1897, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 78) granting a pension to Samuel W. Childs, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3924) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Tallahatchie River, in Tallahatchie County, Miss., reported it with amendments.

REPORT OF COMMISSION TO FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Mr. PLATT of New York, from the Committee on Printing, reported the following concurrent resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That there be printed 2,500 additional copies of the Annual Report of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1899, of which 250 copies shall be for the use of the Senate, 500 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, and 1,750 copies for the use of the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4098) granting a pension to Rebecca L. Price; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4099) for the relief of Thomas J. McGinnis; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 4100) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4101) for the relief of Everett B. Curtis, administrator of John J. Curtis, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4102) for the relief of Robert Logan May; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4103) granting a pension to George R. Warner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEBOE introduced a bill (S. 4104) granting a pension to Annie B. Sharrard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4105) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4106) to correct the military record of Nathan Frolick; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4107) to correct the military record of Squire Stinson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4108) to correct the military record of William Wallace; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 4109) granting an increase of pension to Robert R. Moore; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4110) for the relief of Annie Catharine Mettler; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BACON (by request) introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 4111) for the relief of Thomas G. Verdine;

A bill (S. 4112) for the relief of Pinkney Persons; and

A bill (S. 4113) for the relief of the estate of Charles Coulter, deceased.

Mr. McMILLAN introduced a bill (S. 4114) to prevent the placing of certain signs upon private property in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 4115) for the relief of the estate of Samuel Noble; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 4116) for the relief of George S. Ayre; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 4117) granting a pension to Margaret J. Carpenter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4118) granting a pension to Peter McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4119) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Morse, jr.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

MEDALS FOR NORTH ATLANTIC SQUADRON.

Mr. McMILLAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (S. R. 98) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to cause to be struck bronze medals commemorating the naval engagements on the Cuban coast and to distribute such medals to the officers and men of the ships of the North Atlantic Squadron of the United States; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. PENROSE submitted an amendment providing for the filling of vacancies in the staff of the Regular Army, intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS (by request) submitted an amendment providing that members of the District militia and notaries public in and for the District of Columbia, not otherwise in Government employ, shall not be debarred from practicing before the Executive Departments or the Court of Claims, intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. GEAR submitted an amendment relative to the hours of labor of clerks and employees in post-offices of the first and second class below the grade of chief clerk, intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

CAROLINE L. GUILD.

On motion of Mr. PERKINS, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Senate bill No. 4612, second session, Fifty-fifth Congress, granting a pension to Caroline L. Guild, be withdrawn from the files of the Senate, there being no adverse report thereon.

GOVERNMENT OWNERSHIP OF RAILROADS.

Mr. PETTIGREW submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Senate 3,000 copies each of Senate bill No. 1770 and Senate Document No. 53, this Congress.

DEMANDS UPON CHINA.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I submit a resolution, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President be, and is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, whether the United States has through its representatives joined with any other nation in making demands upon China; and, if so, what is the nature of the demands.

The President is also requested to inform the Senate whether any threat accompany the demands as a penalty for noncompliance.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. ALDRICH. Let that go over.

Mr. HALE. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It will go over under the rule.

INVESTIGATION OF FOOD SUPPLIES FOR THE ARMY.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of Congress the usual number of copies of the "record of the court of inquiry, convened February 20, 1899, in accordance with the instructions of the President of February 3, 1899, to investigate certain allegations of the Major-General Commanding the Army in respect to the unfitness for issue of certain articles of food furnished by the Subsistence Department to the troops in the field during the recent operations in Cuba and Porto Rico;" and that when the same is printed that the original record shall be returned to the War Department for file.

EXPENDITURES FOR PARIS EXPOSITION.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I submit a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

The Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution.

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the Senate for its information the "detailed statement of expenditures of the Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition of 1900," as provided for under the act of 1898, creating the office of "Commissioner-General to the Paris Exposition, and for other purposes."

Resolved further, That said detailed statement should, in the opinion of the Senate, state the number and names, places of residence, and salary paid to experts, clerks, officers, and employees, and should in like manner set out the details of other expenditures.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, the law requires that there shall be a detailed statement made by the Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition. A day or two ago the President sent the following message to the Senate:

I transmit herewith a copy of a letter from Mr. Ferdinand W. Peck, Commissioner-General of the United States to the Paris Exposition of 1900, dated November 17, 1899, submitting a detailed statement of the expenditures incurred under authority of law.

The letter accompanying the message of the President has no statement whatever in the body of the letter about expenditures. There is appended to it, however, a "statement of expenditures made from appropriation for Paris Exposition of 1900 from November 15, 1898, to November 1, 1899, as submitted by Frederick Brackett, secretary and disbursing officer," which is as follows:

Salaries of experts.....	\$72,045.14
Salaries of clerks.....	34,829.11
Officers' salaries.....	17,765.08
Salaries of employees.....	2,732.27
Traveling expenses.....	36,245.15
Buildings.....	38,647.91
Rent, Chicago, Paris, and New York.....	13,436.95
Furniture.....	7,252.69
Stationery and printing.....	5,403.75
Telegraph and cable.....	1,775.00
Miscellaneous.....	10,400.46
Total.....	240,633.51

Here is a total expenditure of \$240,633.51, summed up in less than a dozen items, such as "salaries of experts, \$72,000." It seems to me that this statement submitted by Mr. Frederick Brackett does not comply with the law, which requires that Mr. Peck shall make a detailed statement of his expenditures to Congress, which shall be transmitted through the President to Congress.

The resolution which I have presented asks the President to have such a detailed statement presented. If Mr. Peck has made such a report to the President and it has been overlooked, of course it will be forwarded by the Executive. If he has not made such a detailed statement, then, in my opinion, it is his duty to do so, and when his attention is called to it by the President he will doubtless make it.

The resolution was agreed to.

READJUSTED SALARIES OF POSTMASTERS IN GEORGIA.

Mr. BACON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he hereby is, directed to report upon a schedule to the Senate the readjusted salaries of all postmasters who served in the State of Georgia between July 1, 1884, and July 1, 1874, whose names as claimants appear in the Court of Claims in the case entitled "John T. Paxson and others vs. The United States," No. 18194. Each such stated account to conform in all respects to the order of the Postmaster-General published by circular under date of June 9, 1883, and to the requirement of the act of March 3, 1883, as said requirement was published by the Postmaster-General in the newspapers of the country under date of February 17, 1884, and with such report transmit to the Senate a full copy of the text of the construction by the Postmaster-General of the act of March 3, 1883, embodied in the said circular and publications in the newspapers and in circular form No. 1223, the text of each of which, under date of November 8, 1897, was transmitted by the Postmaster-General to the Attorney-General for use in the case of Jane Yarrington and others vs. The United States, No. 16345.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6959) to extend the provisions of an act entitled "An act granting increase of pension to soldiers of the Mexican war in certain cases," approved January 5, 1893, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent to call up Order of Business 679, House bill 445.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The morning business is closed. The Senator from Nebraska will allow the Chair to lay before the Senate, under the unanimous agreement, the following resolution.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections January 23, 1900, as follows:

Resolved, That the Hon. Matthew S. Quay is not entitled to take his seat in this body as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska was recognized.

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me to make a request for unanimous consent?

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the resolution be disposed of without further debate two weeks from to-day at 4 o'clock.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, I trust there will be no objection to the request, and that the Senate will agree to vote upon the resolution at that time.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator from New Hampshire asks that it may be disposed of in two weeks without further debate?

Mr. CHANDLER. Without debate after that time.

Mr. ALLEN. But it will be debatable up to that time?

Mr. CHANDLER. The resolution will be debatable up to that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire will state exactly his request.

Mr. CHANDLER. I avoided any question as to what motions will be in order by asking that there shall be unanimous consent that two weeks from to-day, at 4 o'clock, the resolution shall be disposed of without debate after that time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the pending resolution shall be disposed of without debate at 4 o'clock two weeks from to-day.

Mr. HALE. That does not cut off subsidiary motions.

Mr. PETTUS. Without debate after 4 o'clock?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without debate after 4 o'clock.

Mr. HALE. That does not cut off subsidiary motions?

Mr. CHANDLER. I have made the request in intelligible language, and I am willing to modify it to suit any one who can suggest better. The object was not to exclude any kind of motion—

Mr. HALE. That is right.

Mr. CHANDLER. Any Senator chooses to make at that time, but that debate shall cease and the resolution shall then be voted on and disposed of.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PENROSE. I understood the Senator from Alabama to make some suggestion as to the phrase "without debate after 4 o'clock."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; he merely suggested that the agreement would not prevent debate up to 4 o'clock. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not think there will be any difficulty in this case, but where a day is fixed for the disposition of a subject of this kind any Senator who chooses to debate it prior to the time of voting ought to have the right to do so, and he ought to have the right to the exclusion of everything else between now and the time fixed for the vote. I suppose there will be no difficulty about that.

Mr. CHANDLER. I suppose the continuous-consideration agreement still continues, so that any Senator who wants to speak before that time would have preference over all other matters.

Mr. HALE. A Senator can speak at any time between now and then.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution is continuously in order. The exceptions made in the unanimous-consent request were appropriation bills, the Porto Rican bill, conference reports, and the bill reported from the Committee on the Philippines by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I take it for granted that an opportunity will be given to debate this question and that even an appropriation bill should give way when a Senator wishes to make a speech on this resolution after the time for taking the vote has been agreed upon.

Mr. CHANDLER. Undoubtedly; there will be no difficulty about that.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not think there will be, but still it is better to have these things understood and to have the matter made plain.

Mr. CHANDLER. We are expecting to hear from the Senator from Michigan immediately.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. I do not expect to say anything about it, and I only submit that those Senators who desire to do so should have the right to be heard as against anything that comes up between now and the time agreed upon to take the vote.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. ALLEN] was recognized.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] having given notice that he will speak to-morrow on this

resolution, if no other Senator desires to speak at this time; I will ask that the resolution may go over until after the routine business to-morrow.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I understand the unanimous-consent agreement has been announced by the Chair as agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to inquire whether any motion to amend the resolution has yet been made?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. A motion to amend has been made and is pending.

Mr. HOAR. To strike out the word "not?"

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is to strike out the word "not."

Mr. CULLOM. With the consent of the Senator from Nebraska, I will call up the bill that is on the table.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to debate the Quay resolution at this moment for about three minutes.

Mr. CULLOM. Let me have a conference committee appointed, and then I will get out of the way.

Mr. HOAR. All right.

GOVERNMENT FOR HAWAII.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 223) to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the amendment of the House and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, I see that the House have passed a substitute for the Senate Hawaiian bill and that on page 8 of the House bill, section 10, they provide "that all obligations, contracts, rights of action, suits at law and in equity," etc., "shall continue to be as effectual as if this act had not been passed." This would allow the enforcement of all existing civil contracts. Contract or slave labor is held by the courts of Hawaii to be a civil contract, and under the Hawaiian law they enforce all contracts by imprisonment and can go to the extent of imprisonment for life. I trust the conferees will see that this provision is so amended as to prevent the enforcement of the existing slave-labor contracts of that island.

The House have adopted the provision that all contracts made since August 12, 1898, are declared null and void and shall terminate, but section 10 also provides:

That no suit or proceedings shall be maintained for the specific performance of any contract heretofore or hereafter entered into for personal labor or service, nor shall any remedy exist or be enforced for breach of any such contract, except in a civil suit or proceeding instituted solely to recover damages for such breach.

Inasmuch as the courts have held that these contracts are civil contracts, I do not know but that there are laws existing in Hawaii that we perpetuate (for we perpetuate a large body of their laws) which provide that damages for a breach of one of these contracts may be collected, and that prior to their collection the person against whom the recovery was secured could be imprisoned. Perhaps their laws so provide. If they do, then until we repeal those contract-labor laws and provide that a suit for damages for the breach of these contracts may be had, these men might still be held for service and compelled to work out the damages upon the plantations under the whip and lash of the slave master. I hope the conferees will carefully guard that provision and see that there is no question about it.

The House bill also provides that the provisions of this section 10 shall not apply to merchant seamen. In other words, it indirectly provides that the existing laws with regard to merchant seamen may be enforced. The existing law of Hawaii makes a seaman a slave during the term of his contract. If he is engaged in foreign service, that is the law of the United States. But in 1893 we passed a law by which a seaman engaged in the domestic trade of the United States could not be compelled to carry out the provisions of his contract or be imprisoned if he failed to do so. I hope the conferees will see that this provision is modified so that at least the laws of the United States with regard to seamen, so far as they apply to our domestic trade, shall apply to seamen engaged in the trade with Hawaii.

I am particularly anxious about this for the reason that on page 50 of the bill the House have provided—

At the expiration of one year after the passage and approval of this act the coasting trade between the islands aforesaid and any other portion of the United States shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of law applicable to such trade between any two great coasting districts.

We put off the time when the coasting laws of the United States shall apply for one year, and I hope this provision will be stricken out entirely. It seems to me that the provision in relation to our coasting trade should apply at once, and I can see no good reason why this provision should be continued.

I find also, on page 26 of the House bill, that there is the following provision:

Prior to each regular election, during the time prescribed by law for registration, have caused his name to be entered on the register of voters for representatives for his district.

I do not know what the Hawaiian law is with regard to registration, but if a law should be so constituted, or if the last legislature should have enacted a law by which no persons could vote at the next election unless they were registered previous to the passage of this bill, which would shut out all the people except the sugar planters of that country, upon whom especially the right of suffrage is conferred, this provision ought to be modified so that any person who is registered previous to the next election, or if not registered can qualify by affidavit, shall be allowed to vote, and that there may be no question upon that score.

We continue the election laws, generally, of Hawaii. I have not examined them, but I think, with the modifications made in this bill, they are reasonably fair, with the correction with regard to registration.

I see the House has also provided that the Federal court appointment shall be for life. It seems to me that provision ought not to be agreed to on the part of the Senate. After a long debate, I believe we changed that provision in the Senate, and insisted that it should be a term, and that the judge could be removed by the President.

I simply wish to call the attention of the conferees to these points in the record, as I think the Senate ought to insist upon them.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not care to say anything now. I ask for a vote on my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate nonconcur in the amendment of the House of Representatives and request a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. CULLOM, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. MORGAN were appointed.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to call attention to the form in which this bill is printed. The original bill is not printed.

Mr. TELLER. It is omitted.

Mr. ALLISON. It is omitted. I think on the record this copy is attached to the original bill.

Mr. CULLOM. The bill as it passed the Senate is in print, and there will be no difficulty in the matter on the part of the conferees.

Mr. ALLISON. Is that the original bill on the Senator's desk?

Mr. CULLOM. This is the original bill, and here is the print which I got from the House before it was printed here.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if the bill is in print exactly as it passed the Senate?

Mr. CULLOM. It is, exactly as it passed the Senate.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Then there should be a reprint of it, together with the House print.

Mr. ALLISON. That should be done. There should be a reprint of the original bill with the amendment of the House.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I ask that we may have a reprint of the bill as it passed the Senate, together with the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota asks that there be a reprint of the Senate bill with the House amendment attached.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to say in justification—

Mr. TELLER. It has always been the custom, so far as I recollect, to have bills printed in that way. I do not understand this new arrangement. We have not the Senate bill here at all now. The amendment should have been printed with a copy of the bill showing what was stricken out and what was substituted by the House. That is the proper way to keep the record. I want to protest against this method of sending bills to us. I do not know whose fault it is.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to say that the proper officer of the Senate came to me with the bill as it passed the House and asked me whether both bills should be printed, and it occurred to me at the time that as we had plenty of copies of the original bill as it passed the Senate it might not be necessary to reprint it, and I told him I thought that would not be necessary. So if there was any fault about it on the part of the Senate it was mine. I want to justify the action of the clerk.

Mr. TELLER. It is not a very serious fault, but I do not want to depart from the usual custom of sending bills here that has been in vogue ever since I have been in the Senate, because that is the convenient way.

Mr. CULLOM. I presume the Senator means to criticize what was done by the House, and not what was done by the Senate.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know whom it is a criticism of, and I do not care. What I want to insist upon is that when a bill goes to the House from this body and is acted upon there, and a substitute bill has been passed by the House, the Senate text and the House text shall come here together as one bill.

Mr. ALLISON. And be printed.

Mr. TELLER. And be printed. That has been the custom.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not think it came in that way.

Mr. TELLER. Lines should be drawn through the Senate bill showing that the House had stricken it out, and then let the House bill be printed following it. That is the way the bill should come, so that we may compare the bill of the Senate with the substitute passed by the House.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he rose with reference to the pending election case?

Mr. ALLEN. No, sir; I have been upon the floor for some time on another matter.

Mr. HOAR. I wish to address the Senate on the Quay election case, which I understand is now up, and I think I shall occupy not more than two minutes.

Mr. ALLEN. I have had recognition here for nearly half an hour, but have yielded to other matters.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator will allow me a few moments.

Mr. ALLEN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

SENATOR FROM PENNSYLVANIA.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution, reported by Mr. TURLEY, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, January 23, 1900:

Resolved, That the Hon. Matthew S. Quay is not entitled to take his seat in this body as a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, among the arguments which have been presented to the Senate with a good deal of earnestness in opposition to the construction of the Constitution which makes it the duty of the governor of a State to appoint a Senator whenever there is a vacancy and the legislature is not in session has been the argument that there is likely to be intrigue on the part of the executive of the State to prevent a choice in order that he himself may exercise this power, which is supposed to be a desirable one.

It never has seemed to me that there was very great practical force in that argument, or that it was a contingency which the framers of the Constitution would ever have dreamed of; but it has made an impression on so many able and intelligent Senators that I have no doubt I am wrong in underestimating its force. I wish to point out to the Senate that the force of the motive to prevent an election, in order that it may go over to another year, when it is hoped that there may be a change of political parties, is a much stronger one than the one which may operate upon the governor, and it is a motive which would be likely to affect members of the legislature itself.

I wish to introduce into this discussion a chapter of the history of the State of Indiana, where the election of a Senator was put over three times in the expectation that by defeating an election by a majority the other party would get a majority twelve months later, and would then elect its own Senator; and I think in the third instance the object was accomplished.

Mr. President, the history of this transaction is very well stated in the Tribune Almanac of 1859, occupying a little more than two pages; and if I may be permitted to have that history printed as part of my remarks in the RECORD, I can save the time of the Senate and not read it. I therefore ask that this may be printed as part of my remarks as if I had read it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOW THEY ELECT BOGUS UNITED STATES SENATORS IN INDIANA.

In 1845, fourteen years ago, it became the duty of the Indiana legislature to elect a United States Senator. The house was Whig by 10 majority, the senate a tie, and Jesse D. Bright, as lieutenant-governor, presided over it. Although the house repeatedly invited the senate to meet them in joint convention to elect a Senator, every one of their resolutions was lost in the senate by the casting vote of Mr. Bright, its president. The election was thus staved off for the session; the next legislature was "Democratic," and Mr. Bright received the vacant Senatorship as his reward.

In 1855 another Senator was to be elected. In the senate, in consequence of half of its members being hold-overs, there was 2 Democratic majority; but in the house there were 16 anti-Nebraska majority, making 14 Republican majority on joint ballot. The house sent resolution after resolution to the senate for joint convention to elect a Senator and the numerous State officers which the constitution and the laws required to be filled by that session of the legislature. But the senate, by a party vote, steadily refused to join the house, leaving the Senatorial seat vacant and the entire patronage of the State in the hands of the Democratic governor.

Two years passed by and in 1857 Indiana elected her next legislature—a majority on joint ballot, under the issue of "Buchanan and fair play for Kansas," being Democratic. But, as it happened, while the house had a Democratic majority, the senate now, by the change in the former hold-overs, had an opposition majority of 4. In giving a narrative of what subsequently

occurred it should be borne in mind that the Republicans were willing, from the first to the last, that both Senators (to fill the vacancy and for Mr. Bright's full term) should be chosen by a concurrent vote of each house, acting separately, and they demanded as their right only the Senator for the vacancy which they had fairly won by the 12,000 anti-Nebraska majority of the people and 14 majority in the legislature at the previous election, and which they had been deliberately cheated out of by their opponents.

The constitution of Indiana requires that the votes for governor and lieutenant governor shall be counted in the presence of both houses of the legislature, and the Democracy determined to use this to trap their opponents into a joint convention, which, as no law for electing Senators exists in Indiana, should immediately after the counting elect two gentlemen to that office. The Republicans insisted that, in the absence of law, the Constitution of the United States was the only guide in the matter. That instrument declares that Senators shall be elected by "the legislature;" and the constitution of Indiana defines the legislature to be the senate and the house, and requires all acts of legislation by them to be assented to by a majority of the entire membership of each, acting separately.

From the official report and the official copies of the journals of both branches of the legislature appended to Senate Report No. 275 (volume 2, Reports U. S. Senate, 1857-58), we find the following facts:

On the 12th of January, 1857, the house sent to the senate a resolution inviting them to be present in their hall at half past 2 p. m. "to open and publish the returns of the election."

The Republican senators offered to concur, with a proviso that as soon as the counting and swearing in was over the joint meeting should be adjourned sine die. But while this was pending, and before any vote was taken on the invitation of the house, and thirty-five minutes before the time designated in the resolution, Lieutenant-Governor Willard, who was presiding and who was also the governor-elect, vacated his seat, and, followed by a minority of the senate, repaired to the representative hall, leaving the senate still in session. Arrived there, this sham joint convention opened, the speaker of the house in the chair. After counting the votes, one of the Democratic senators was, without any motion or any vote, called upon to preside. He took his seat and, without any proposition from any member whatever or any vote being taken, adjourned the joint convention till Monday, the 2d of February, without stating any reason or pretext for its reassembling.

It becoming evident that a fraudulent election of Senators was about to be attempted (all persuasions to seduce the majority of the senate into a joint convention having failed), the senate, on the 29th of January, four days before the time at which the unauthorized convention was to meet, adopted a solemn protest against it by a vote, by ayes and noes, of 27 to 20, declaring that they had given no assent to any joint convention for any purpose whatever; that any pretended assemblage of that sort would be illegal and fraudulent, and branding in advance any attempt to thus elect Senators as insulting to the senate and disgraceful to the State.

This formal and solemn protest, thus adopted by 27 out of the 50 State senators, staggered the conspirators; and when the 2d of February arrived, although the new lieutenant-governor, with a minority of the senate, again repaired to the representative hall, leaving the senate still in session and going on with their business, nothing whatever was done or attempted; but the presiding officer, without any motion or any vote, and without stating any object whatever, declared the joint convention again adjourned till the following Wednesday.

On Wednesday, the 4th of February, the pretended joint convention again assembled—and it should be borne in mind that the affidavits of the secretaries of the senate set forth the fact that the senate was never even invited by the House to meet them in joint convention for the purpose of electing Senators from the first day of the session to the last—when, without any motion or resolution by any member of this illegal assemblage, the lieutenant-governor instructed them "to proceed to choose United States Senators by a viva voce vote." Whereupon 23 senators (out of 50) voted for Bright and Fitch, one senator, who was present looking on, refused to vote; 40 out of the 100 representatives (it requires by the State constitution two-thirds of the whole number of members to make a quorum for transacting business in either branch) voted for the same candidates, and two other representatives voted for George G. Dunn and R. W. Thompson.

The lieutenant-governor declared Bright and Fitch elected, and again, without any motion or vote, adjourned the joint convention till February 11. The intention was at that time to go on and choose the State officers whose election they had prevented two years before, but finding that the incumbents, though of their own party, would not consent, without a legal contest, to be ousted by any such bogus election, the joint convention, when the 11th of February arrived, was adjourned sine die and the patronage again left in the hands of the governor for the ensuing two years.

The senate having protested against this fraud on the 29th of January in advance of its commission, again repudiated it the day after its alleged consummation. On the 5th of February 27 senators out of the 50 signed and placed on their journals a protest, a copy of which they sent to the United States Senate, declaring that their body had not participated in the election, was in session when it pretended to have occurred, and most solemnly protesting against the recognition of this fraud.

With these papers came up also a petition to the United States Senate, signed by 27 senators and 36 representatives, remonstrating against this fraudulent election, which was not participated in by a quorum of either branch, declaring this alleged joint convention unauthorized by any law of the State, by any resolution adopted by the legislature, or by any provision of the State or National Constitution, and that to affirm it would destroy the existence of the senate of Indiana as an independent branch of the legislative department of the State. And to make their argument unanswerable, the sworn affidavit of 26 senators accompanied these protests, each of them solemnly declaring that they did not participate in this so-called joint convention, but were, at the very hour of its alleged assembling, sitting in their seats in the senate, in open session.

Thus it will be seen that this case differs from the Harlan or Iowa case most materially. In that election both branches had agreed to the joint convention, and had voted repeatedly but ineffectually for Senator; but finding at last that a Republican was about to be elected, a majority of the senate, being Democratic, absented themselves; and although Mr. Harlan had a clear majority of the whole legislature, the Democrats in the United States Senate turned him out of his seat. After this decision, the above high-handed and disgraceful outrage was carried through in Indiana in the very teeth of the Harlan decision. And the same United States Senate, after staving it off for over a year, with the usurpers meanwhile in their seats, voting Lecompton, appropriation bills, etc., ratify it at last, in the expiring hours of the last session, by 7 majority.

The sitting members at the regular session of 1857—at the extra session and again at the last regular session—insisted that they must have more testimony than the records afforded; and finally, on February 16, 1858, a resolution passed giving them ninety days to take it in, before any judge, by giving notice thereof to the protestants. But, after this long delay on this pretext, they did not give a single notice under the resolution, and the only evidence they proffered was ex parte affidavits of political friends, taken when no cross-examination was allowed.

The Republicans, however, gave notice, and proved by Governor Willard himself, by William Sheets, ex-secretary of state, and O. H. Smith, ex-United States Senator, that no joint convention to count gubernatorial votes had ever even attempted to adjourn over for the transaction of other business; and the two latter witnesses, who had known the usage in Indiana for electing United States Senators for thirty years past, testified that there never had been a precedent or a parallel for this. As one reason for retaining these Senators in their seats was that there were no contestants claiming them, the Indiana legislature now in session and fresh from the people, having passed in each branch, by decisive majorities, a resolution denouncing the pretended election as fraudulent, unconstitutional, and void, propose to elect two others, legally and regularly, and to instruct them to demand the two seats in the United States Senate, which belong to the sovereign State of Indiana, but to which that body, in spite of the above protests, saw fit to elect and install these fraudulent claimants.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to suggest to the Senator that he might add to that the record of the contest in California, lasting for about eight years, when, on each occasion, the effort was made to defeat an election for the purpose of postponing, as was the case in the contest between the Broderick and the Gwin factions, which lasted for a number of years. That was the issue before the legislature.

Mr. HOAR. Of course that was in the old times when the Senator was elected by concurrent vote of the two houses, and not by a majority on joint ballot.

Mr. STEWART. That was the case.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. For the purpose of having the record complete, I should like the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Nevada to state whether in any of those cases the governor assumed to appoint a Senator.

Mr. HOAR. I do not understand that he did. I do not remember about that; I have not looked it up.

Mr. STEWART. I was residing in California at the time, and was perfectly familiar with the transaction.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The governor did not attempt to appoint.

Mr. STEWART. No; he did not attempt to appoint.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think, Mr. President, that the opinion of the then governor of California or the then governor of Indiana as to this constitutional question is of much importance in a case where so great a constitutional authority as the Senator from Connecticut has expressed his opinion.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, if no other Senator wishes to speak on this resolution, I ask that it may go over until tomorrow after the routine morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIGHT AND FOG SIGNAL, DELAWARE BAY.

Mr. PENROSE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 3639. It is only a few lines in length, and will take but a moment.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3639) authorizing the establishment of a light and fog signal on the new breakwater, harbor of refuge, Delaware Bay. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a light and fog signal on the new breakwater, harbor of refuge, Delaware Bay, at a cost not exceeding \$30,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLOTMENTS OF LANDS IN SEVERALTY.

Mr. QUARLES. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 890, being Senate bill 3901. It is a measure, against which there is no objection, to provide for the allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians in one of the Wisconsin reservations. It has been recommended by the Indian Bureau and unanimously recommended by the Committee on Indian Affairs.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3901) providing for allotments of lands in severalty to the Indians of the La Pointe or Bad River Reservation in the State of Wisconsin.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLARE M. ASHBY.

Mr. ALLEN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 445) for the relief of Clare M. Ashby, widow of W. W. Ashby, late United States consul at Colon.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Clare M. Ashby, the widow of W. W. Ashby, \$2,866, being the balance of one year's salary.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ISAAC R. DUNKELBERGER.

Mr. SHOUP. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 3283) for the relief of Isaac R. Dunkelberger.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It authorizes the President to nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Isaac R. Dunkelberger, late a captain, First United States Cavalry, and brevet Lieutenant-colonel, United States Army, a captain of cavalry in the Army, and provides that when so appointed he shall be placed on the retired list.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALPHONSO M. POTVIN.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1710) for the relief of Alphonso M. Potvin.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Alphonso M. Potvin, late of Colon, Republic of Colombia, \$11,270.85, in full payment and satisfaction of all indebtedness of the United States to him, arising from his purchase, on July 21, 1888, at public auction, of the then United States consul at Colon, of three houses located in that city belonging to the estate of Susannah Smith, who had previously died there intestate, the houses being sold to Potvin by the United States consular representative, who, being unable to protect the title in the local courts of Colombia, caused a loss to said Potvin of all moneys paid by him for the property, as well as other losses and expenses, amounting to the sum aforesaid.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE BLAND.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the resolutions from the House of Representatives on the death of the late Representative BLAND may now be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolutions from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, April 7, 1900.

Resolved, That the business of the House be now suspended in order that suitable tribute may be paid to the high character and eminent public services of the Hon. RICHARD PARKS BLAND, late a most distinguished member of the House of Representatives of the United States from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect for the memory of the deceased, the House, at the conclusion of these memorial exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House transmit a copy of these resolutions to the family of the deceased statesman, and inform the Senate of the action of this body.

Mr. COCKRELL. I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk and ask for their present consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, late a Representative from the State of Missouri.

Resolved, That the business of the Senate be now suspended in order that fitting tribute be paid to his memory.

Resolved, That the Secretary be directed to communicate a copy of these resolutions to the House of Representatives and to the widow of the deceased.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, "If a man die, shall he live again?" has been the great question presented to our race in every age as generation after generation has come and gone. Happy is the human being whose intellect and conscience with divine faith answers this question, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." He of whom I shall speak briefly to-day could so answer.

For twenty years Mr. BLAND and myself were intimate personal and political friends. I knew him well, and shall speak of his career and character to-day without exaggeration.

There was nothing spectacular nor sensational about Mr. BLAND. He was not a political graphophone, always speaking, nor an "importunate mendicant for popular applause." He was an earnest, honest, modest man of strong intellect and profound convictions of duty. So profound were those convictions that they caused his death. I know from his own lips that his health became impaired years ago when he stood by the side of Samuel J. Randall in the House of Representatives and fought to exhaustion against the first force bill introduced in that body. I know that the immediate illness which caused his death was produced when, in feeble health, on the last night of the last Congress, he remained without sleep at his post of duty guarding the interests of his constituency in the large appropriation bills then pending.

Mr. BLAND was the father and pioneer of bimetalism in the United States and gave his life to that cause. He had studied the question in all its phases, not only in the writings of eminent financiers, but in the canyons and mining camps of the far West, where Pike's Peak towers with its snow-crowned brow above the smaller mountains like some hoary-headed monarch of the feudal ages surrounded by his grim nobility.

He was a real bimetalist, not a pretender. He believed with

Daniel Webster and James G. Blaine, that gold and silver were the money of the Constitution and that Congress had no right to strike down either of the precious metals in order to increase the purchasing power of the other. He believed that never could there be more gold and silver taken from the earth than was necessary for the legitimate pursuit of business.

He was no stickler for ratio, although he preferred the old ratio of 16 to 1, because our people were accustomed to it and large expense would be put upon the Government in order to make a new ratio suitable to the silver coinage in circulation.

In 1893, when the bill was pending in the House of Representatives repealing the purchasing clause of the Sherman Act, Mr. BLAND, as leader of the bimetallic party in the United States, offered amendments providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratios of 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 to 1; and when these were rejected he proposed the reenactment of the provisions of the old Bland-Allison Act of 1878, which declared that not less than two nor more than four million silver dollars should be coined each month. All these propositions were defeated. It then became evident that no compromise was admissible; that the advocates of the single gold standard intended to close the mints of the United States against the coinage of silver as standard money of ultimate redemption.

Believing that bimetalism was the cause of humanity, that the welfare of the laboring masses, not only in this country, but throughout the world, was imperiled by the combine of the single gold standard, which is intended to enhance the value of incomes and to make the labor of mankind subservient to capital, Mr. BLAND declared for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1, without the consent of foreign nations. He believed that this was the last chance for bimetalism in all time. He knew, and never concealed it from others, that if successful this proposition would involve financial disturbance and even panic; but he preferred what he thought would be a temporary disturbance to permanent disaster. He believed that this great Republic, made for the people and by the people, should, like France, stand for bimetalism, with all its great productive and exporting powers, because it meant liberty, the corner stone of free institutions.

Mr. President, RICHARD PARKS BLAND should have been the nominee of the Democratic party naturally and logically at the great national convention of 1896, held at Chicago. I know personally that he did not desire that nomination. I know that he, above all others, knew his precarious health, that the icy finger of Death might touch him at any moment. I know from his own lips that he dreaded the labor and responsibilities of the Presidential canvass and of the great office for which he was named. He was defeated, as all leaders of great popular movements who have borne the heat and burthen of the day and excited the bitter antagonism of opponents have always been defeated in all ages and countries when success was about to crown their efforts. Political parties are actuated not by gratitude but by the hope of success. It has always been so, and will be so to the end of time. The regicides of England who beheaded Charles I before his palace at Whitehall did not long retain the power they had grasped, but surrendered in a short time to Cromwell and his associates.

Vergniaud and the other great leaders of the Girondists, who inaugurated the French Revolution and dragged the King and Queen of France to the guillotine, followed in a few short months over the same gloomy road.

In our own political history, Henry Clay, the great leader of the old Whig party, the father of "the American system" which now dominates this country, the most magnetic orator who ever spoke in the Senate of the United States, was shoved aside in 1848 to make room for Zachary Taylor, whose political opinions were almost unknown to the convention that nominated him. William H. Seward and Charles Sumner sat by the cradle of the Republican party and defended its childhood against the vitriolic eloquence of the Southern leaders, but both were superseded in 1856 by John C. Frémont, the Pathfinder, and William H. Seward was defeated in 1860 by Abraham Lincoln, who but two years before was unknown outside the limits of his own State.

So, in 1896, RICHARD PARKS BLAND, the veteran leader of bimetalism, who had stood by its banner when others faltered and deserted, was put aside for a young and brilliant orator, who was a schoolboy when BLAND introduced and passed through the House of Representatives in 1878 the first bill providing for the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1. Always has it been so. The hands that place to-day upon the pedestal of popular favor their idol will shatter that idol on the morrow. Varied is "the mind of desultory man, studious of change and pleased with novelty."

Mr. President, in his domestic and social life Mr. BLAND was the most lovable and loyal man I have ever known. His heart was in his home, and he infinitely preferred the pure steady light of domestic love to the garish glare of public life. How true and loyal he was to wife and children was shown in an incident of the preliminary canvass for the nomination at Chicago in 1896, when

the bigots and fanatics and slimy demagogues assailed him because his wife was a Roman Catholic and was educating her children in that communion. His answer touched the heart of manhood throughout the world: "Yes," he said, "my wife is a Roman Catholic and I am a Protestant, and shall live and die one; but my great regret is that I am not half such a Christian as the woman who bears my name and is the mother of my children."

When he left this city he went to his modest home in the Ozark Hills of Missouri, all of the estate he had after twenty-two years' service in the National Congress, and, when death had taken from him the power of speech, his last act was to extend his hands in mute benediction above the heads of the dear ones kneeling around him.

Mr. President, his body lies in the soil of the great Commonwealth whose people loved and honored him so long, and his spirit has passed across the dark river to be greeted on the other side by the five children who went before him.

The night is gone,
And with the morn those angel faces smile
Which I have loved long since, and lost awhile.

Statesman, patriot, stainless gentleman, and dear friend, farewell.

Mr. JONES of Nevada. Mr. President, it is a time-honored custom that amid the clash and turmoil of debate and disputation in our legislative halls a truce is called on occasions such as this in order to note with solemnity the departure of one of our number upon the vast and silent journey to Eternity. The time thus spent could not be better occupied. It affords us an opportunity to pay a tribute of affection and respect to a departed friend and colleague; at the same time it brings before the mental vision of each and all of us the insecurity and uncertainty of life, and the fact that there is no escape for mortal man from the inexorable call of Death.

The Representative in whose memory the usual proceedings of the Senate are to-day suspended was a familiar figure in this Capitol for a period of nearly a quarter of a century.

RICHARD PARKS BLAND was born in 1835 in the State of Kentucky, where he resided until he was 20 years of age, when he moved to Missouri. Thence, touched by the spirit of adventure, he went, first to California, and later to that portion of the Pacific coast which afterwards became the State of Nevada. Locating in Virginia City, Mr. BLAND entered upon the practice of the law and the development of the mineral resources of the country. In 1865 he returned to Missouri, where he practiced his profession until called by the electors of his district to represent them in the National Legislature. He was elected a member of the Forty-third Congress, and took his seat in December, 1873. With the exception of a single term, he continued to represent that district with distinguished ability from that time to the date of his death.

I made his acquaintance in the early days in the far West, and then formed of him that high opinion which time and further acquaintance only strengthened and confirmed.

In 1876 and 1877 it was my fortune to be closely associated with Mr. BLAND upon the monetary commission created by joint resolution of Congress of August 15, 1876.

The resolution creating that commission and defining its duties is as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives, That a commission is hereby authorized and constituted, to consist of three Senators, to be appointed by the Senate; three members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker; and experts, not exceeding three in number, to be selected by and associated with them; with authority to determine the time and place of meeting, and to take evidence, and whose duty it shall be to inquire—

First. Into the change which has taken place in the relative value of gold and silver; the causes thereof, whether permanent or otherwise; the effects thereof upon trade, commerce, finance, and the productive interests of the country; and upon the standard (of) value in this and foreign countries;

Second. Into the policy of the restoration of the double standard in this country; and, if restored, what the legal relation between the two coins, silver and gold, should be;

Third. Into the policy of continuing legal-tender notes concurrently with the metallic standards, and the effects thereof upon the labor, industries, and wealth of the country; and

Fourth. Into the best means for providing for facilitating the resumption of specie payments.

In the course of the proceedings of that commission its members had ample opportunity to observe the earnestness, zeal, and ability displayed by Mr. BLAND and the warm interest which he took in the important inquiry that had been committed to the charge of the commission.

This is not an occasion, Mr. President, for the discussion of the merits of great controverted questions, but the work done by our colleague who is no longer with us, and the noble motive which inspired his conduct, can not be understood without the statement that in the remonetization of silver Mr. BLAND perceived the only effective means of arresting the ruinous fall of prices that for so many years had depressed the business conditions of the United States and had relegated to idleness large numbers of his fellow-countrymen.

With the insight of a statesman and political philosopher he saw that one of the great aims of a nation should be the adoption of policies that will automatically set in motion the forces necessary for the uninterrupted employment of all the people, and that for this purpose there is needed such constant and regular increase in the quantity of money as will preserve from artificial and unnatural depression the prices of the products of labor.

For him it was not enough that the laborers actually employed were able in certain cases, with greater or less success, to uphold the wages paid; it was also necessary that the large numbers of laborers who were compulsorily idle should be called to employment by those who could profitably utilize their services.

By a restoration to silver of the unrestricted access to the mint, which it had enjoyed from the dawn of civilization, Mr. BLAND saw one of the great instrumentalities for maintaining, in connection with the annual yield of gold and carefully regulated issues of paper, a quantity of money sufficient for all the purposes of industry.

From his wide reading of economic literature and his experience and observation in the mining regions, he was aware that the world had never had and never would have too much of either of the precious metals or of both combined. To him the refusal of Governments to utilize to the fullest degree the output from the silver mines seemed like a deliberate rejection of one of the most beneficent of the bounties of nature.

The silver cause, therefore, appeared to Mr. BLAND to be the great humanitarian cause of the closing years of the century. It evoked the deepest sympathies of his nature, and appealed to him, not as an economical necessity merely, but, as well, as a high religious duty. With all the fervor of a crusader he entered upon its propaganda, and during all the years of his public life he was a tower of strength to those associated with him in the effort to restore silver to its historic place as a money metal of unrestricted coinage.

It is with this question of silver remonetization that Mr. BLAND'S public career will always be linked and associated, and it is undoubtedly with that question that he would wish history to especially connect him. He held, with all the force of religious conviction, that every interest of society and civilization demanded the unrestricted coinage of both gold and silver; and he devoted the best years of his life to the attempt to ingraft such a result upon the legislation of the United States.

Wherever, throughout the world, the money question has been discussed—and it has been discussed everywhere—the name of Mr. BLAND has become a synonym for silver. The terms "Bland law" and "silver law" are recognized the world over as synonymous. It is, however, but justice to the memory of Mr. BLAND to say that the so-called "Bland law"—the law of February 28, 1878—as proposed by him and passed by the House of Representatives, was a bill to authorize the free coinage of the standard silver dollar.

This was changed in the Senate to a bill which, instead of unrestricted coinage, provided for the purchase of from two to four million dollars per month of silver bullion, in which form, as the only practicable one in which its final passage could be secured, it was accepted by him and the other friends of silver and passed over the veto of the President.

The personal characteristics of Mr. BLAND were such as to endear him to all who knew him. While strong, determined, and unflinching in the pursuit of duty, he was always genial, patient, and kindly. He was one of the few men in public life who knew how to make friends and yet could avoid making enemies. He had not an enemy in the world. All who came in contact with him knew that he carried into his public work every element of conscience and of rectitude that distinguished his perfect private life.

Like all men of true greatness, Mr. BLAND was a man of exceeding simplicity of character. His intellectual processes were of the most direct kind. He did not seek the aid of the false, the meretricious, or the gaudy. He disdained to resort to any argument that was not based upon what he believed to be immutable truth. Notwithstanding the bitterness sometimes caused by heated political debate, he never lost the esteem of his opponents. They knew him for what he was and respected him for the noble qualities of head and heart that they knew him to possess. Above all else, he was a man of profound sincerity of conviction and rectitude of purpose.

In private life Mr. BLAND was the soul of honor; he was the ideal husband, father, friend, citizen. In every relation and transaction his conduct was guided and governed by the highest standards.

We shall miss the genial smile and hearty greeting with which he was wont to meet his many friends; but the work which he performed will long continue to influence the minds and consciences of men.

Mr. BLAND leaves to his family a name and reputation of priceless value, and to his country an imperishable example of a noble,

dignified, true, and faithful leadership in a great cause. His fame rests secure in the hearts of his countrymen.

He was a man of the class so well described in the lines of one of our own writers:

God give us men! A time like this demands
Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office can not buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor—men who will not lie;
Men who can stand before a demagogue
And damn his treacherous flatteries without winking!
Tall men, sun-crowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, in the few words which I shall utter to-day in regard to the life and character of Mr. BLAND I shall endeavor to speak of that life and character as it seemed to me. I shall endeavor to speak of him as I think he would have desired a friend to speak—that is, to tell the simple truth, without exaggeration in any way whatever.

Mr. President, I think it can be truthfully said that no man has served in Congress for the last twenty-five years who had a stronger hold upon the affections of the great body of the American people than RICHARD P. BLAND, of Missouri. While his life was conspicuous in many ways, it was preeminently so as the earnest, sincere, and devoted friend of the poor people; of the people who move in the humbler walks of life; the people who daily toil for their daily bread.

He had been intimately associated with them in their everyday life; he knew the difficulties under which they labored, the privations which they endured, and how hard the battle of life was for them, and every sympathy of his heart went out to them, and he spent his life in an earnest, constant, and never-ceasing effort to better their condition and to contribute to their happiness. Whatever in his judgment promised or tended to better their condition and to make their pathway less rugged and less difficult, he supported and advocated. And whatever added to their burdens or brought to them additional toil he opposed and resented as though it were a personal injury to himself.

Mr. BLAND believed that the change of policy upon the part of the Government in 1873 from a double to a single standard of money was a crime against the class of people to whose service his life was devoted. He believed that this change from the policy taught by the founders of the Republic brought suffering and want to many thousands of people whose condition in life made them least able to bear injustice and wrong; and, so believing, he began the great battle which he waged unceasingly for twenty-five years to right that wrong. He was the great and universally acknowledged leader in the fight.

Others grew weary, lost hope, ceased to battle or deserted to the enemy, but the faith of Mr. BLAND never wavered and his courage never faltered. He met defeat after defeat, but his purpose grew stronger and all the energies and resources of his great mind were brought to bear in the great contest that he waged against wealth and power. And while he did not live to see the great principles for which he contended triumphant in the nation, yet he did see the great party in which he was a conspicuous leader make the idea and the principle for which he had so long contended the leading and overshadowing issue in the contest for control of the Government.

It has been sometimes said that Mr. BLAND felt keenly disappointed that he was not selected to lead the Democratic ticket in 1896. This I know personally to be untrue. He said to me but a short time before the convention in 1896 that he thought it a mistake for his own State to have given instructions for him for President; that the cause was everything and the individual nothing; that his highest ambition in life was to see the cause succeed, and that the convention ought to be left entirely free to select that man whose leadership would contribute most to bring about the great reform that was so dear to his heart.

And his manly conduct while the convention was sitting and the earnestness and enthusiasm that he displayed on behalf of the ticket tended to show that he felt relieved rather than disappointed at the nomination made. That he felt keenly and deeply disappointed at the failure of Mr. Bryan to succeed, all of his intimate friends know; and while he never lost faith in the final triumph of the great cause, and while his voice was still heard urging his friends and followers to continue the contest, I think the great hope that it might be accomplished while he yet lived had passed away. I think that the disappointment which came from the defeat of the cause in 1896 contributed in part to the death of this great man.

It has been said that Mr. BLAND was a man of one idea, but this also is untrue. The records of the House show that in all the great questions which came before Congress while he was a member that he took a leading part in the discussions, always showing the highest intelligence and the most accurate and thorough knowledge of the issues involved. And in the great fight he made for

the restoration of silver he believed there were other great questions involved. He believed that if the policy of our Government could be changed in regard to the money metals, the same power which brought about this change would be sufficiently potent to bring other changes, but that sooner or later, if the wrong was not righted, the Republic, which was founded on the idea of equality, would cease to be a Republic of the people, for whom he felt such a keen interest.

I know it seems commonplace to say that he was a thoroughly honest man, a truthful man, and earnest, sincere, unselfish man, a generous and just man, yet it was because of these great qualities that he was a great man—great because he has shown to the youth of this land that a man simple in his habits, modest and unpretending in his life, can, by the practice of the virtues I have named and by earnest effort to better the condition of his fellow-man, leave behind him a name and a fame that will long be cherished as a precious heritage by his fellow-countrymen. And I earnestly believe that as the years go on the fame of RICHARD P. BLAND will grow greater and greater, as the history of his pure life and his high and lofty purposes become better known.

The people of every land and every clime who struggle for liberty, who fight for justice, who contend against the tyranny and injustice of great wealth and great power will long remember the name of the great Missourian, who was their friend, who fought their battle, who devoted his life to an earnest and sincere effort to better their condition.

The people of Missouri were not more devoted to him than were the people of my own State. He was our near neighbor. Hundreds of the people of Arkansas knew him personally, and when the news came that his life was at an end the sorrow and grief were universal.

I was present at his funeral. There were many thousands of people assembled around his grave. They came from every part of Missouri and from Arkansas. Hundreds in his own and the adjoining counties came in wagons, in buggies, on foot, and on horseback. They were the sturdy farmers of southwest Missouri—the men with whom he had been associated in his daily life—and as they looked upon his face for the last time each seemed to feel that he had suffered a personal loss and that the truest and best friend that the poor and helpless had ever known had passed to the great beyond.

And the thought came to me then that this love and this devotion of these people was far dearer to Mr. BLAND in his lifetime than all the wealth the world can bestow; and, having devoted his life to relieving the distress and suffering of the people, when the end of life drew near, that thought must have tended to illuminate the dark river over which he was soon to cross and tended to make the farther shore seem less to be dreaded and less to be feared.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. President, born and reared to early manhood in the State which I have the honor in part to represent in this body, the personal and public career of RICHARD PARKS BLAND was always looked to by the people of Kentucky with the most affectionate interest. When we can say of one who has completed the life work set before him and joined the innumerable caravan that passes on before, that he was a good citizen, a kind and considerate neighbor, a loving husband, and an affectionate father, and that to all these ennobling attributes he added the graces of the Christian gentleman, we have the embodiment of a good man, and the words of legitimate eulogy are almost exhausted.

All these things can be truthfully said of RICHARD PARKS BLAND. When he gave up the duties he had to perform in this life and passed to the other side to rest under the shade of the trees, there was no man who more completely represented American manhood, the conscientious American public servant, the unselfish American patriot than did RICHARD PARKS BLAND.

No man who has been a public servant for a quarter of a century almost, as was Mr. BLAND, and who was a participant in questions that excited the greatest public interest and the fiercest controversy ever excited less uncharitable or ungenerous criticism. Every man knew him to be honest. Everybody looked on him as an upright man. All of us, whether we differed from or agreed with him, recognized that he was following the course pointed out by the conscientious investigation of the question with which he was dealing and felt he was serving, to the best of his ability and according to the lights before him, the interests of the people who honored him with a seat in the American Congress, and, as he believed, the best interests of the people of the entire country.

Amiable he was, but his amiability was not the attribute of weakness. His amiability was the evidence of the innate gentility that came upon the earth when RICHARD BLAND was born.

He was in every sense of the word a national character, and it was that of the statesman and not the politician.

This, Mr. President, is not the time to discuss political differences. Questions which assume the gravest importance in the deliberations of the Federal Congress, questions which attract the

widest attention with the American people, are temporal and transitory in their character, and in the face of the great unknown sink into comparative insignificance. It is a consoling reflection to the family and friends of Mr. BLAND that those who differed with him the most widely nevertheless regarded him with the same high estimate in which he was held by his closest political friends.

When he came to die, when the news flashed across the continent that this great and good man was about to be lost to his country forever, there was universal regret. National sorrow manifested everywhere, and it was to no degree tempered by any feeling of past political differences with this representative American.

I never heard a man speak of Mr. BLAND except in terms of affectionate regard, and I know that in his native State all the people of every party and persuasion looked on his life and on his career as an honor to the State that gave him birth, and they joined with the people of their sister State, the home of his adoption, in mourning his death as they to-day join in doing honor and reverence to his memory.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, in the closing days of the Fiftieth Congress I formed the acquaintance of RICHARD PARKS BLAND. During the Fifty-first Congress it was my privilege to serve with him on the Committee of Coinage, Weights, and Measures of the House of Representatives. The acquaintance then formed ripened into a friendship which extended over a decade, growing warmer as the years passed. Death claimed Mr. BLAND on the 15th day of June, 1899. On that day his loyal and gentle life went out, leaving friendships to crystallize into sanctified memories. In conformity with an ancient and beautiful custom we this day devote a session of the Senate to paying tributes of respect to the memory of our lamented friend and official associate. The life and character of RICHARD P. BLAND need not the charity always benevolently extended to the dead. His was a pure and praiseworthy life.

He was unusually modest and retiring. He was neither self-asserting nor self-seeking. He sought the back seat rather than the front place in any meeting he happened to attend. His voice was low, his manner unobtrusive. Being of medium height and fair proportions, his physical presence harmonized with his disposition to avoid conspicuous notice. He was slow to enter into conversation with strangers, and the glamour of the social life of the capital had no charm for him. Anyone acquainted with his record as a public servant would have been at a loss on first meeting him to account for the source of his strength and the basis of his just fame as a parliamentary leader. Although an able and experienced jurist and a statesman of world-wide reputation, his was the manner and the dress of the well-to-do, well-read, and no ghastly farmer. His mildness of manner and gentleness of disposition in the home circle or in the committee room gave no forecast of the bold, fearless, and irrepressible representative, whose masterful advocacy of his settled and unchangeable convictions promptly secured and, without design, held for him an exalted place in the American Congress for more than twenty years.

The dashing, self-confident young college man encountering him unawares would have yielded the ground, not before a torrent of offensive declamation, but through self-confessed inability to answer the apparently simple interrogatories of a kind country gentleman in quest of knowledge.

He was a patient student. His inquiries were directed toward a definite purpose and all his energies were concentrated for the accomplishment of that purpose. He explored the realms of literature that he might reduce the strength of all recorded thought to the service of his cause. His knowledge of books was extensive, but of that knowledge his speeches only convey a partial view. To him the productions of imagination were of little service. His sympathies were moved by the matter-of-fact features of the problems confronting men. The ceaseless struggle of humanity for better average conditions touched his heart, engrossed his mind, and absorbed his life.

With earnestness amounting to intensity he devoted himself to the study and advocacy of such public measures as seemed to him calculated to crystallize justice into law. He believed that a great wrong was inflicted on the world by the demonetization of silver, and without variation or sign of change he addressed himself to the task of restoring that metal to its former privileges at the mints of the United States. The great contest for the restoration of silver has engaged the attention of the civilized world for a generation. Men of world-wide renown have given to the subject their best thought. With some it may have been a theme for mere academic debate; with others a stimulus for spasmodic effort and pyrotechnic display; but with RICHARD P. BLAND it was an issue—living, vital, momentous.

To his steady hand, unfailing constancy, and well-equipped mind, the honor and responsibility of leadership were given in this country without solicitation, question, or dispute. He was

the leader of a movement rather than of a party. He was the exponent of a thought which found support in all parties and in all sections of the country. To him the scattered elements looked as to a standard bearer. With the assistance of able men from the ranks of every party, Mr. BLAND kept the issue so prominently before the country that for over sixteen years all parties felt constrained to promise fair terms to him and to his people. Defeat did not discourage him. With constancy, courage, and tenacity unsurpassed, he braved sneers, jeers, and opposition of every sort. Feeling conscious of the worth of his cause and the rectitude of his purposes, defeat left him instructed but not conquered. That success did not crown his efforts is a fact not recorded to his discredit. With him the fight closed only when the Master's summons came.

Had he been more inclined to assert himself, he would doubtless have been the Presidential candidate of the Democratic party in 1896, when for the first time the cause for which he had stood so long and so faithfully was approved by a convention of his party associates. But the valiant commander was not chosen to lead. His neighbors continued to reelect him to the House of Representatives, but failing health weighed heavily upon him during his last term of service in that body. I spent many evenings with Mr. BLAND at his Washington residence during the last session of Congress he was permitted to attend. He was my neighbor in this city, and in the light of a neighbor and a friend I knew him well. To know him was to become bound to him by ties of affectionate regard. In him simplicity of life and sincerity of heart were united with clearness of intellect, strength of purpose, and dauntless courage. During our last visit he seemed inclined to talk seriously of the future of his family. At the time my attention was not specially arrested, but on hearing of his unexpected death shortly thereafter I recalled what he had said as indicating that he must have then realized that his end was near and that his guiding hand would soon fail those he loved.

At the close of a long life spent in the public service he left his family in limited circumstances. Like many other distinguished members of Congress who had gone before him, Mr. BLAND had looked so steadfastly to his country's interests that he had neglected to give due attention to his own affairs. An honored name is the chief legacy left by him to his family. A celebrated Roman orator defined true honor as the concurrent approbation of good men. Measured by this fair test the name of RICHARD P. BLAND is a priceless treasure to his family. He was a man of honor. Men differed with his views sharply, and his positions on public questions were often assailed with bitterness; but no man ever had reason to question his integrity or the purity of his motives. Indirection was foreign to his nature. The makeshifts of concealment or evasion never found place in his public service. He was an open, frank, honest man. His character was his capital, and it never diminished in value. He was not the slave of vulgar ambition.

His was the ambition of the philanthropist seeking the triumph of a cause for the good of humanity. His repeated elections to Congress were accepted by him and recognized by his opponents as the victory of his cause rather than the glorification of the man. He became the embodiment of an idea to which his life was devoted. Public station was accepted as an opportunity to advance that idea. With the high office of Representative in Congress came many duties, which Mr. BLAND discharged with scrupulous regard for the public welfare, but the central and controlling object of his personal and official efforts was the remonetization of silver. His pronounced identity with that great question gained for him the sobriquet of "Silver Dick" and "Silver Dollar" BLAND. His name has been indelibly set in our laws and parliamentary history on the subject of coinage. This is not a fitting occasion to indulge in the task of weighing the merits of his contentions nor in speculating on the future of the issue on which the force of his life was expended. On the contest over that issue, inspired and ably maintained by him, his fame rests secure, irrespective of the merits. His motive rested on the immutable foundation of honesty.

The honest and able efforts of our departed friend will be remembered alike by his adherents and by his opponents with the sense of pride and gratification always felt by patriotic men in the presence of the demonstrated courage, fidelity, and virtue of a countryman.

Seclusion was his desire; unsolicited fame his reward. Detraction, that missile flung from little minds by vicious tongues, can not impair his fair fame. In every relation of life he was true and faithful. He endeavored to the full measure of his ability, to leave the world better than he found it. Through example, he still lives among us. To him the mystery of death has been disclosed, and with the aid of Christian faith we may, with consolation, perceive immortality beyond that mysterious line.

The most eloquent agnostic of this generation, standing by the uncovered grave of one he had tenderly loved, said in anguish of spirit, "We cry aloud, and the only answer is the echo of our

wailing cry." The absence of faith made room for that pitiable despair. I would not call the figure despicable, as the offspring of fear or the child of dishonesty. It springs not alone from want of faith in the truths of divine revelation, but likewise from a failure to fairly consider and justly estimate the necessary attributes of the higher, the nobler, the purer, the immortal elements combined with human nature. That part of man returned by mourning friends to mother earth was weak, dependent, and in peril from the moment of birth to the instant of death, and yet in death it is indestructible. During life it was the tenement of the invisible spirit which, vitalizing and illuminating, made of it the inspiration of our affections, the correspondent of our intellects, and the companion of our souls. The separation of the spirit from its tenement of clay is what we call death. The body, through decay, changes form, but is not destroyed.

Knowing that the gross objects visible to our imperfect sight can not be destroyed, how foolish seems the faithless one who would consign to a dark and boundless abyss of insensibility and nothingness the bright, vivifying, resplendent force which, even while fettered to common clay, penetrates the mysteries of the stars, solves the problems of the earth, measures the depths and conquers the currents of the seas, subjugates the passions of animal life, and brings to the aid of existence here an ever-increasing measure of order, love, benevolence, and lofty aspiration. The force is primary. It can not die. It is the soul of man. His conscience, his emotions, his thoughts, his yearnings for a higher and better life are but manifestations of its existence. A man of gigantic intellect and unflinching faith has said that "to reason about faith is to doubt and deny."

As to faith in the immortality of the soul, I take issue with the statement. The infidel mind must reason out of existence too many things of which every human being is more or less conscious before finding a firm basis for unbelief, accompanied by mental repose. Our friend was not annihilated when his weary mortal body surrendered to its final impulse. The earth could not reclaim more than its own. As by the eternal law of attraction each primary source recalls its scattered fragments, so to its Omnipotent Creator the spirit of our departed friend has been recalled. The legacy of his life and its ennobling example is the common heritage of all mankind. His lifelong course of undeviating rectitude secures to his afflicted family an imperishable title to honorable distinction. Well may the widow and children who mourn him find consolation in the words—

God gave, He took, He will restore.
He doeth all things well.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas. Mr. President, no man ever laid down his life with a reputation freer from spot or blemish than did RICHARD P. BLAND. He served his State and country with a fidelity and singleness of purpose which has never been surpassed. Simple in his tastes, intensely domestic in his feelings, devoted to his family, he was a pure patriot, an honest man, and a faithful public servant.

In my public service it was my good fortune to be intimately associated with him for years and to reckon him amongst my warm personal friends, and in all the years of this intimate association I never saw an action of his, nor heard a word from him which was not becoming a Christian and a gentleman. No man of purer character or more blameless public or private life ever honored an American constituency by faithful and honorable service. If a good name is better than great riches, then he left to his family an inheritance most desirable and one which will endure when the great fortunes of those who have devoted their lives to money getting shall have passed away.

Mr. BLAND was preeminently a man of the people. Utterly incapable of being swayed from their interest by an advantage to himself, he was so splendidly poised that no prospect, no matter how alluring, could disturb his equilibrium. When he was being voted for in a great convention of his countrymen, by the political party in which he had spent his life, for the highest place in the gift of the people, he, away from telegraphic communication, with no party of friends about him, was pursuing the even tenor of his everyday life at his quiet home in Missouri in the happy association of his wife and children. He was ready then, as he was at all times, to assume any responsibility which his countrymen might impose on him, or to follow the quiet, even tenor of his own home life, without regret and without repining, if permitted to do so.

Unselfish and patriotic, he gave his life to his country, and left to his family a name which will live in the hearts of his countrymen. He was one of the men to see at a very early day, clearly and distinctly, what he believed to be a great wrong perpetrated upon civilized mankind by the financial legislation of this country and others about 1873, and to the repeal of that legislation in this country he devoted his days and his nights. While his efforts were unavailing, while he failed to accomplish the great purpose he had in view, no bitterness disturbed the calm serenity of his

mind, and no loss of hope for the future or of faith in the Republic ever found lodgment in his heart. With an unflinching trust in an overruling Providence, and an unshaken faith in the integrity and intelligence of his countrymen, he had no doubt that the best would result from agitation and discussion, and that whether he had his way or not, that the best results to the American people would at last be brought about.

No one who had the honor and pleasure of knowing the man as I did could fail to love him, to admire and respect him, and I shall cherish through all my future life the memory of his friendship as one of the blessings which a kind Providence has granted me. His name, his family, and his memory belong to the nation.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, it is but natural when we rise to speak of our dead associates that words of praise come to our lips. I shall speak of the Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND, now dead, as I have frequently spoken of him living. I have discovered no excellencies since his death that I did not recognize and appreciate when he was living.

The Hon. RICHARD P. BLAND for many years filled an important position in American legislative affairs, and it is but fitting that we should pay respect to one who has discharged all the great duties devolving upon him with so much ability and with so much credit not only to himself but to his country.

He was left an orphan when very young, and struggled with adverse conditions, but did not fail. By his unaided energy he acquired an academic education and fitted himself for the responsible duties that ultimately devolved on him.

In his early manhood he went to Missouri; later to California, where he remained a number of years. I am not familiar with the details of his life in the far West, but I know he was interested in the great mining industries of that country and that he practiced his profession and held an office of honor and trust.

In 1865 he returned to Missouri and entered on the practice of his profession. He was elected to the Forty-third Congress as a Democrat. He was repeatedly reelected, and when he died he was still bearing the commission of the people of Missouri in the House of Representatives. He was a member of every Congress from his first election to the last, save the fifty-fourth Congress, for which he was defeated by a majority of 70 votes out of a total vote for himself and opponent of 33,700. He was reelected to the Fifty-fifth Congress by a majority of nearly 5,000.

My first acquaintance with Mr. BLAND was in the last session of the Forty-fourth Congress. He was at that time chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining. I soon learned to appreciate his sterling qualities and formed an admiration and an affection for him that lasted until his death.

At the next session of Congress he introduced a bill for the free coinage of silver at the ratio of 16 to 1 and passed it through the House of Representatives by a large majority. It did not pass this body, but the result was the passage of a compromise measure known as the Bland bill, which restored the silver dollar to the circulation of the country.

From 1876 to the time of his death his name was closely associated with the great economic struggle, begun in the United States largely by his influence and support, for the restoration of silver as primary money in the currency of the world.

He believed that the restoration of silver as primary money was in the interest of all classes, but especially to the interest of the producing classes. His earnest and intelligent support of the measure in Congress and out of Congress made his name and fame familiar, not only to the people of United States, but to the political economists throughout the world.

It is not strange that when his political party, after a spirited contest, incorporated that principle in its platform thousands of men of that faith turned to him as the logical candidate of their party for President. But Mr. BLAND had never advocated a financial policy for the advantage that might accrue to him; and when another received an honor that many thought belonged to him, he accepted the result without criticism or complaint and gave the candidate his untiring support.

The great economic principle for which he had contended for so many years had secured a permanent place in the political creed of his party, and that was enough for one who had always put principle above personal and party advantage.

RICHARD P. BLAND was an earnest, courageous supporter of what he considered right, an equally earnest opponent of what he considered wrong.

He was independent, self-reliant, obedient to his conscience, impartial in judgment, and could not be swayed from duty by policy or public clamor. He was an honest man, a patriot, an American statesman of the best type.

His devotion to duty, as he saw it, with reference to the financial questions before Congress; his clear comprehension of the character and importance of the questions, and what it involved; his logical and forcible presentation of his views on many occasions, will always associate his name with that important and still

unsettled question, whether the world can dispense with the use of silver as primary money or not, and his influence on that question has not ceased with his death.

It may be well doubted whether anyone who has served in Congress during the last twenty-five years has created for himself a more enduring memory than RICHARD P. BLAND, a memory untarnished, a memory that may well be the pride of the people who honored him with their support, and whom in turn he honored by his worthy conduct in public and private life.

No higher praise can be bestowed on living or dead than to say his life is a worthy example for American youth, and this we may say of RICHARD P. BLAND.

As a Representative in Congress he secured and maintained the confidence of his constituents and the country at large for loyalty to principle, devotion to duty, courage and capacity in the discharge of the obligations and duties of a great trust, and his life and public service must be an encouragement to well-doing to those who may have aspirations to succeed him in public life. Good and faithful public servant, the only reward he desired was the approval of his own conscience and the approbation of the people for the discharge of his public duties in a way to serve the great body of the American people.

This need of praise will not be withheld by even his political opponents.

[Mr. ALLISON addressed the Senate. See Appendix.]

Mr. DANIEL. Mr. President, death has stricken the name of RICHARD PARKS BLAND from the roll of the House of Representatives.

Another now fills the seat which he occupied for nearly a quarter of a century, and the world goes on in its accustomed ways, even as the sea rolls on in restless, unchanging mood when some noble craft has sunk into its depths. But hard by the rolling waves are those who miss and mourn and weep for the unreturning sail.

It is the old, old story, often repeated in manifold phases in our American life, that is told to-day. The poor boy going west, far away from his old Kentucky home, plunging into the frontier life, fighting Indians and mining metals; the struggling youth gaining little by little the rewards of toil; the lawyer growing into confidence and competence; the husband and father planting his home in Missouri and gathering to it the things that conduce to refinement, comfort, hospitality, and good cheer, and making it the center of his life work amidst those whom he loved and who in turn loved him. Then the representative of the people in the Congress of the United States and the ripe and forceful statesman, trustworthy and trusted in all things, seeking no sordid or selfish end, veraciously acting up to the admonition of Wolsey, "Let all the ends thou aimest at be thy country's, God's, and truth's."

The House of Representatives is the training school and the strenuous battlefield of American public life. There the Paladins have fleshed their maiden swords. The Representative is the one person of all the hundred thousands of Federal agents who is chosen by the people and in him more than in any other is reflected the genius of a people's government. There can be no loftier office. Success in that forum, as in the conflict of arms, must be and is accepted as the just test of merit.

Orators, scholars, authors, lawyers, and men distinguished in all the walks of human endeavor often go there with high reputations for ability and disappear and make no sign. Others hitherto unknown to the country rise there to eminence, honor, and power. Mr. BLAND fitted the House of Representatives and the House of Representatives fitted him. He studied the questions of the day with conscientious diligence, and his speeches upon them reflect the best thought in favor of the propositions he maintained.

He was always at his post, attentive to his duties, ready, logical, earnest, cogent in debate, the peer of any who crossed his lance. Force of energy and force of character, a certain adaptability to the rough and ready fight, are the elements of success in that body, and only the strong and the sufficient man can succeed. Mr. BLAND was a success. His name became a fortress and a sword and a flag to his followers, and the countersign that he gave them was worthy of him—"Put the cause above the man."

For twelve terms he was chosen a Representative. The tie that binds united the faithful constituency and the faithful public servant. Nothing but death or promotion could have dissolved it. The fact speaks, and the fact will forever speak, his deathless eulogy when the lips that praise him to-day are silent.

Jackson, Van Buren, Polk, Pierce, Lincoln, Garfield, and McKinley found in the House of Representatives the stepping-stones to the highest office that any man on earth can hold, the Presidency of the United States; and for a time the star of promise hovered over BLAND. The great historic party to which he belonged, and of which he was in all his life a true type and representative, contemplated him as its candidate for this great office.

The tenor of events favored him. The convention met. It was spurred to aggressive action by the vain makeshifts and disap-

pointments which had attended previous efforts to restore to its place the ancient hard silver money of the Constitution and the country, the money whose story is the history of civilization. It was quickened in its hopes by an aroused public opinion formed under conditions that gave omens of victory. It adopted as its leading principle the idea of which BLAND had been a pioneer and the constant and leading champion, and it cleared deck for action. His friends were justly elated. The door seemed to swing open for him to vast possibilities of usefulness and honor. And then the star of his destiny declined as quickly as it had shone forth.

But it left him as it had found him, in the unruffled repose of his country home and in equanimity and sweetness of spirit. If ambition did not lead him up the shining heights, neither did it fling him from the Tarpeian Rock. No words of complaint or reproach or disappointment fell from his lips. He was ready for duty, and duty he did with loyal fervor. He emerged from the conflict higher in the respect and good will of the people than when he entered it, unscathed in reputation, approved in character, superior to the illusions of ambition, and undisturbed by its fickle blandishments. The world knew him now as a well-balanced, right-hearted, and just-thinking man, worthy of its honor and its trust.

Xanthippe, the wife of Socrates, said that in the myriad revolutions that had overtaken Athens and their own home she had always seen the same expression on the face of Socrates going forth in the morning and coming back in the evening. In serenity of temper, in philosophic mood, and in the even conduct of life the Missouri statesman was not unlike the great Greek; and the great Commonwealth of the Middle West that has sent to field, House, and Senate so many illustrious sons has given to our history no worthier name.

The delegation from Virginia, of which I had the honor to be a member, voted for Mr. BLAND for the Presidential nomination, and stuck to him until his own delegation recognized the then self-evident fact that the able and brilliant orator from Nebraska had won the convention's favor by his wonderful eloquence, and had so fixed its choice. He was well worthy of it, and no one recognized his merit more readily than BLAND, and no one had a higher opinion of BLAND than Bryan.

Whatever had been the result, BLAND would have been an excellent candidate. Had he been elected we would have had an old-fashioned Democrat in the White House, worthy of the party of Jefferson and of Jackson. He would have felt his responsibilities as conscientiously as any man who ever sat in the Executive chair. Accessible to all, he would have heard and considered all, and would have acted with discretion and decision. He would have been the relentless foe to monopoly, the devotee of equal rights, the lover of the Constitution, and the friend of the people, without sectional hatred or partiality. His simplicity would have attracted to him that ingenuous affection that delights in plain, direct, and unostentatious ways, for he was indeed, as the laureate says of Wellington, "in his simplicity sublime," and like Washington in that "his modesty was equal to his merit."

Mr. President, "there is a moral to all human tales." That which belongs to the career of RICHARD PARKS BLAND is worthy to be cherished. His life was characterized by no particular feats of brilliancy, but its force and influence were steady and constant, pertinacious, continuous, and faithful, "enduring to the end." There was nothing of dramatic incident about it. He was a real man, and the cast of his mind was realistic. He took life seriously and dealt with it honestly and bravely, seeing its plain facts and plain obligations in no grotesque or fanciful shapes nor in lurid or colored lights, but in just proportions and in the white light of truth. He had no affectations or attitudes or poses, and as it never occurred to him to mislead or deceive others, so he did not mislead or deceive himself. Of this character are the world's great body of most useful and successful men.

"I must dazzle and astonish," said Bonaparte, and he did dazzle and astonish the world. But none were more dazzled and astonished than himself. He was dazzled by Moscow; and he lost his army in the Russian snows. Who more astonished than he when the holdfast grit of Prussia and England wrenched the scepter from his grasp? Who more astonished than he when the matter-of-fact "nation of shopkeepers," as he called them, and, in truth be it said, hard and bluff conqueror, rejected his theatrical overtures of protection and hurried him off to his island cage, an extinct volcano like himself.

BLAND was nothing of "the dazzle and astonish" kind. He would have been a poor actor in a melodramatic troupe. He was an Anglo-Saxon, an American through and through. He stood for the common weal and the common right. His life was dominated by the genius of his race, whose highest expression is found in its steadfast common sense.

Nature is altruistic. She has so made man that he can not live unto himself alone save as an unfinished and insufficient creature. Neither can he do anything for himself alone save in scant and imperfect manner. She has correlated, interlaced, and fused

together the lives and fortunes of men in social unity. The food and clothing of the laborer are the products of many climes and many hands, of many toils and many tears. A cotton handkerchief, a tin cup, a pin, a nail, a match—who can make one of them by himself alone? Yet by the united toil of others how cheap to everyone!

This thought is the germ of union and the bond of fraternity. Throughout all human kind each must of necessity contribute his just part to the common weal. Nothing is sadder than working for self, the fruit unshared by others. And well is this illustrated in the story of Enoch Arden, who, deemed dead by his wife, found her wedded to another, and who, concealing himself, that she might not know he lived, was forced to work for himself alone.

Yet since he did but labor for himself,
Work without hope, there was not life in it
Whereby the man could live.

The poorest man on earth is he who has piled up riches by selfish and sinister methods and who is constrained by his surplus and cumbrous wealth to look around for objects which may stir to life his latent and long-suppressed regard for others and make company for his lonely and discontented spirit. But rich indeed is he who spends as he goes his life and his work and his means and whatever is his for others with a free, unstinting hand and makes himself no bankrupt debtor to lost opportunity for doing good.

The life of BLAND was altruistic, like that of many worthy representatives, and it is the glory and safety of our race and of our country that it has many such of all shades of political opinions. He lived and worked for home, country, and friends. His democracy was a religion. It possessed him heart and hand and soul. Offending none, he made no enemies. All gave him respect and all trusted him; a tribute rare and honorable and blessed to those who gave as well as to him who received; a tribute bespeaking in the giving the love of truth and justice that lies forever in the human heart. Clear in his great office as representative of the people, he died in peace, with their confidence and love about him, and he leaves to them and to his country and to his family and friends a memory of sweet savor and a name without a stain.

They laid him to rest beneath a hickory tree in the churchyard at Lebanon, in the Ozark hills of Missouri, his home, and there he sleeps well. The strong, stout-fibered tree is a fitting emblem of his life. The melodies of the birds which sing in its branches as the springtime renews its green leaves are his fitting requiem.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, RICHARD PARKS BLAND was of the highest type of American manhood. His life was devoted to doing good, and his name is a household word.

On the discovery of the Comstock, in 1859, Carson County, of Utah, included the country which now composes the State of Nevada. Within a year after this great discovery more than 30,000 people were assembled in the mining region of which Virginia City was the center. It was a genuine mining excitement. Under such conditions, in protecting the rights of the weak and maintaining law and order, individual character was rapidly developed.

Mr. BLAND, although quite a young man, immediately became a marked figure. Judge Cradlebaugh, one of the judges of Utah Territory, was assigned to Carson County. Judge Childs, a Mormon, was judge of the Utah probate court, which had very large jurisdiction under the Utah statutes. Genoa, about 30 miles from Virginia City, was the county seat.

In August, 1860, after some months' residence in the Territory and active participation in mining operations, Mr. BLAND was, on my motion, admitted to the bar, and at once engaged actively in the practice of the law. He was a strong character, courageous and industrious, and enjoyed from the first confidence and respect in a community where weak men were ignored. In the fierce excitement of conflicting interests which made others waver, falter, and fail, he was firm and constant. The judges frequently remarked in my hearing that Mr. BLAND's preparation of his cases was thorough, and that his clear and straightforward presentation of them was most convincing. If the members of the bar who were associated with him during his residence in Nevada were still living, they would gladly bear testimony to the virtues and manhood of Mr. BLAND. But so far as I am able to learn, I am his only surviving associate at the bar while Nevada was a part of Utah.

It gives me great pleasure to say of him that he was kind, generous, intelligent, industrious, and good. He won the love of those who knew him well and the respect of all to an extent that few, if any others, enjoyed. He did not remain in Nevada long enough to take part in the events of bonanza times, but a future was open to him when he left, and his name is still cherished by the surviving pioneers of Nevada wherever they may be found. The independence of character, the firmness of resolution, and the

adhesion to principle which were shown during his short career in Nevada were fully exemplified and made known to the whole country during his long service in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BLAND's views on all great national questions were known of all men. His position was never doubtful. His life in the West and in Congress furnishes an example which will not be forgotten, but will be emulated by the strongest and best of those who shall come after us.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, RICHARD PARKS BLAND, to whose memory we pay tribute to-day, was born on August 19, 1833, in the county of Ohio, in the State of Kentucky.

His father, Stoughton Edward Bland, was a native Kentuckian and a descendant of the Blands of Revolutionary fame and was educated for a Presbyterian minister. Owing to ill health, he engaged in farming and was so engaged at the time of his death in the year 1842.

His mother was a Miss Nall, daughter of Richard Parks Nall, of Kentucky, and died in that State in the year 1849. By the death of the father the family was left largely dependent upon their own labor.

Anxious to obtain an education, young BLAND worked during the summer for six and seven dollars per month to enable him to attend school during the winter. He attended Hartford, Ky., Academy and took a teacher's course one year.

On leaving that institution at the age of 18, he began teaching; taught two terms in his native county, and then, going to Wayne County, Mo., taught one term, and went to California in 1855, where he taught school and studied law.

From California he went to the then Territory of Utah, and was elected treasurer of Carson County and held that office from 1860 until the organization of the State government of Nevada. He was admitted to the bar by the United States district court in Utah.

In 1865 he returned to Missouri and located at Rolla, in Phelps County, for the practice of law, in partnership with his brother, Charles C. Bland, now one of the judges of the court of appeals in the eastern district of Missouri.

In 1868 he removed to Lebanon, Mo., which was his home thereafter, continuing the practice of the law and conspicuously participating in the discussion of the public questions then agitating the country. In November, 1872, he was the nominee of the Democratic party for Representative in Congress from the Eighth Congressional district, and was elected to the Forty-third Congress, beginning March 4, 1873.

In 1873 he married Miss Virginia Elizabeth Mitchell, daughter of Gen. E. Y. Mitchell, of Rolla, Mo.

He was successively renominated and reelected a Representative in the Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-first, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses.

He was renominated for the Fifty-fourth Congress and defeated by the stay-at-home voters, caused by the discontent of the Democrats with the Administration, which resulted in the defeat of eight other Democratic nominees for Congress in Missouri.

In 1896 Mr. BLAND was renominated for Representative in the Fifty-fifth Congress and was elected.

In 1898 he was nominated for the fourteenth time and was elected, for the thirteenth time, a Representative in the Fifty-sixth Congress, beginning March 4, 1899, and died at 4.30 o'clock in the morning of June 15, 1899, before the Fifty-sixth Congress had convened, having served through eleven Congresses—Forty-third to Fifty-third, both inclusive, twenty-two consecutive years—and then through the Fifty-fifth Congress, two years more. During his illustrious career in the House his principal committee service was as a member of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which he was the chairman in the Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, Fiftieth, Fifty-second, and Fifty-third Congresses.

In the Forty-fourth Congress, on July 31, 1876, Hon. Randall L. Gibson, of Louisiana, presented a joint resolution (No. 159) for the appointment of a Congressional commission to inquire into the relative value of gold and silver and kindred questions, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

On August 5 Hon. S. S. Cox reported a resolution similar to Mr. Gibson's, which was passed on the same day and reported to the Senate August 7 and referred to the Committee on Finance, and on August 8 Senator Sherman reported from the Finance Committee S. 1037, in substantially the same language as the House resolution.

On August 15 Senator Morrill, after explaining the slight variance of S. 1037 and the House resolution and the lateness in the Senate, asked the Senate to pass the House concurrent resolution, and it was passed. In pursuance of this joint resolution the Senate appointed Senators JOHN P. JONES, Lewis V. Bogy, and George S. Boutwell, and the House appointed Representatives Randall L. Gibson, George Willard, and Richard P. Bland, and the experts were Hon. William S. Groesbeck, of Ohio, and Prof.

Francis Bowen, of Massachusetts, with George M. Weston, of Maine, as secretary.

This "United States monetary commission" made a most thorough, critical, and exhaustive inquiry into the whole monetary question in all its relations, and through our foreign ministers obtained reports upon the monetary systems of twenty-one of the leading nations of the world, written answers to written interrogatories from many eminent persons in the United States and foreign countries, and took the testimony of twenty-five eminent persons; all of which they submitted to Congress on March 2, 1877, in the Senate by S. Report 703, in two volumes—an invaluable treasure of information and facts.

Through this investigation Mr. BLAND became thoroughly conversant with the monetary question and an intelligent, fearless, and aggressive advocate of bimetalism by the restoration of the standard silver dollar to free, unlimited, and independent coinage equally with gold at the old ratio existing from 1837 to the coinage act of 1873 depriving it of any coinage right. He never wavered or faltered in his position to the end of his life. On December 13, 1876, in the Forty-fourth Congress, Mr. BLAND offered a substitute for H. R. 3635, favorably reported by him on July 19, for the free, unlimited coinage of the standard silver dollar equally with gold with full legal-tender power. This substitute was agreed to and passed and sent to the Senate, where no action was taken.

In the Forty-fifth Congress, at the called session, on November 5, 1877, Mr. BLAND moved to suspend the rules and pass "An act to authorize the free coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," which was agreed to and passed, and sent to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Finance.

On November 21, 1877, Senator ALLISON, from the Finance Committee, reported the bill to the Senate, with amendments, striking out the free-coinage provision and inserting the purchasing clause of not less than \$2,000,000 nor more than \$4,000,000 of silver per month and the provision for an international monetary conference. On February 15, 1878, the amendments were agreed to and the bill as amended was passed and returned to House, where on February 21 the Senate amendments were agreed to and the bill passed. On February 28, 1878, the bill was vetoed by President Hayes and passed over his veto on the same day and became a law. From that day to his death Mr. BLAND used every effort promising any chance of success to secure the free and unlimited coinage of silver equally with gold and to prevent the repeal of the law of February 28, 1878.

In the Fifty-third Congress, in March, 1894, Mr. BLAND's bill requiring the immediate coinage into standard silver dollars of the profit or seigniorage in the bullion purchased under the Sherman law of July 14, 1890, amounting to \$55,156,680, and then the coinage of the remainder of such bullion into such dollars, to be used in redeeming and canceling the Treasury notes of July 14, 1890, issued to purchase such bullion then outstanding, to the amount of \$152,951,280, was passed, sent to the Senate and passed, and vetoed by President Cleveland on March 29, 1894.

Mr. BLAND, during his service, was the earnest advocate of a tariff for revenue, and an equally earnest opponent of a high protective tariff and opposed the recharter of the national banks.

When the McKinley tariff bill was pending, Mr. BLAND offered an amendment providing, substantially, that foreign manufactured products purchased by the exchange or by the proceeds of exported farm products should be admitted free of duty.

After President Cleveland's veto of the Bland seigniorage bill bimetalism became an exciting question, and its friends began an earnest, vigorous campaign to secure delegates to the national Democratic convention in 1896 who could neither be corrupted nor intimidated to a surrender of that principle.

It was believed in Missouri that some members of the State central committee were not friendly to the free and unlimited coinage of the standard silver dollar equally with gold at the old ratio. Many meetings were held and a State Democratic convention was called, by order of the State central committee, to meet at Pertle Springs, Mo., on the 6th day of August, 1895. The convention met, with strong delegations from almost every county in the State, made Mr. BLAND chairman, and passed resolutions strongly favoring free-silver coinage equally with gold. There was in the convention a strong feeling to indorse Mr. BLAND for the nomination for the Presidency in 1896. This movement was strongly opposed by Mr. BLAND, and no action in that direction was taken.

The feeling, however, continued to grow in strength, notwithstanding Mr. BLAND took the position that it was not wise for Missouri to have a Presidential candidate. His sincerity was never questioned, but he could not control his friends.

When the State convention assembled at Sedalia, Mo., on the 15th day of April, 1896, the delegates were almost unanimous for Mr. BLAND as one of the delegates at large to the Chicago convention and for indorsing him as the choice of Missouri for the nomination for President.

Mr. BLAND's position was characteristic. He said:

If I am the candidate of this State for the Presidential nomination, it would not be becoming in me to go as a member of the delegation from this State to the convention.

He was consequently not chosen as a delegate, but was unanimously indorsed by the convention as the candidate of Missouri for the Presidency.

He returned to his home, near Lebanon, Mo., and remained there until after the national convention had made its nomination, refusing the importunities of his friends to attend meetings anywhere or to do aught that might be construed as electioneering for himself or promotive of his candidacy for nomination. His candidacy was not of his own seeking. The good people of Missouri had seen distinguished gentlemen of acknowledged abilities and high character, eminent and influential in party councils and intrusted with high official positions, who for years had been outspoken advocates of bimetalism and professed friends of silver, turn their backs upon their past records, and to the money power and executive power, freely exerted, "crook the pregnant hinges of the knee where thrift may follow fawning."

Knowing Mr. BLAND's sincerity and honesty of purpose, his uncompromising integrity, his moral courage, and unyielding firmness, and his lifelong devotion to and advocacy of the restoration of bimetalism, they naturally regarded him as the personification of that monetary principle. The Democratic national convention met in Chicago on July 7, 1896, and completed its organization and adopted its platform on July 9. Most of the nominations for the Presidency were made on the night of July 9, and the remaining ones on the morning of July 10, when the balloting began.

Fourteen distinguished gentlemen received votes on the first ballot, the result of which for the seven receiving the highest number of votes was announced as follows: RICHARD P. BLAND, 235; William J. Bryan, 137; Robert E. Pattison, 97; J. C. S. Blackburn, 82; Horace Boies, 67; John R. McLean, 54, and Claude Matthews, 37.

The result of the second ballot for the three receiving the highest number of votes was as follows: BLAND, 281; Bryan, 197, and Pattison, 100.

The result of the third ballot for the two receiving the highest number of votes was: BLAND, 291; Bryan, 219.

The fourth ballot resulted in 241 for BLAND and 280 for Bryan. At the beginning of the fifth ballot ex-Governor William J. Stone, of Missouri, one of the delegates at large from that State, addressed the convention, saying:

Two or three days since I received this note, which I will now read in your hearing, from RICHARD PARKS BLAND:

"I wish it to be understood that I do not desire the nomination unless it is the judgment of the free-silver delegates that I would be the strongest candidate. If it should at any time appear that my candidacy is the least obstruction to the nomination of any candidate who is acceptable to the free-coinage delegates in the convention, or one more acceptable to a majority of those delegates than myself, I wish my name at once unconditionally withdrawn from further consideration. I am willing to waive the State instructions for me, if need be, and let the free-silver delegates decide the whole matter. The cause must be put above the man."

I came to this great city as one of the delegates from Missouri, voicing the sentiment of the Democracy of that State, to present for your deliberate consideration the name of that illustrious commoner for whom many of you have expressed preference by your votes in this convention. To those who have been our friends in the struggle I desire now to return my grateful appreciation. But, following the directions of Mr. BLAND himself, that whenever a majority of the silver delegates in this convention shall have expressed a preference for another he desired his name unconditionally and peremptorily withdrawn. I now, in the name of Missouri, lower the standard under which we have fought throughout this convention, and in its place I lift that of the gifted and glorious son of Nebraska.

The nominations for the Vice-Presidency were made on July 11. Mr. BLAND on the first ballot, without having been nominated and with the votes of Missouri cast for others, received 62 votes.

On second ballot, when many votes were being cast for Mr. BLAND and Missouri was called, ex-Governor Stone said:

The State of Missouri presented the name of one of its citizens for the Presidential nomination. In the wisdom of this convention another was selected. The delegation has no authority to present the name of that citizen for the second place upon the ticket. If it is done by this convention, it must be done of its accord, without solicitation by the Missouri delegation—

And cast the votes of Missouri for other names.

On the second ballot 294 votes were given to Mr. BLAND.

On the third ballot 255 votes were given to Mr. BLAND.

After the announcement of the result of the third ballot, ex-Governor Stone addressed the convention, saying:

I desire on behalf of Missouri, and as the friend of Mr. BLAND, to express to you our grateful appreciation of your kindness. I am now in receipt of a telegram from Mr. BLAND, in which he says, substantially, that he would deem it unwise and impolitic to nominate both candidates from the west side of the Mississippi River. He directs me to say that the nomination of Mr. Bryan has his warm and hearty approval, and he thinks the nomination for the Vice-Presidency should be made with one object alone in view, and that is the strengthening the ticket. Accordingly, he directs me to say that he wishes his name withdrawn from the consideration of this convention for that purpose.

Mr. BLAND remained quietly at his home during the sessions

of the Chicago convention, gracefully accepted the result, and entered most heartily into the campaign for the success of the nominees. Immediately after the convention an effort was made to induce him to become a candidate for the nomination for governor of Missouri. He positively declined, saying he would prefer to continue in Congress. He was then again nominated for Congress in the Eighth Missouri Congressional district—in which he was defeated in 1894—and was triumphantly elected.

The most conspicuous efforts of Mr. BLAND in his long and historic career in public life were his earnest, able, and persistent advocacy of the restoration of bimetalism by the free coinage of the standard silver dollar equally with gold at the old ratio. His opposition to the recharter of the national banks, and his advocacy of the right of the Government to issue the paper currency of the country, and, of the reduction of tariff taxation to a revenue basis.

His public life was exceptionally upright, exemplary, and honorable; free from any suspicion, even, of anything disreputable, corrupt, or dishonorable.

His success in public life did not in the least affect him in his manner or bearing. He continued through life the same plain and unassuming gentleman, avoiding, rather than seeking, public attention, notoriety, or ostentation.

His habits were simple, abstemious, and exemplary. He was a pleasant associate, a true friend, a faithful and devoted husband, a loving and kind father.

He has bequeathed to his country, his friends, and his bereft wife and children an honored name, "a good name better than precious ointment," "rather to be chosen than great riches," and a private and public life worthy of all emulation.

Mr. President, I ask for the adoption of the resolutions.

The resolutions were unanimously agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect and love for Mr. BLAND, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to: and (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, April 11, 1900, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, April 10, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

PORTO RICO.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I report back the bill (H. R. 8245) to provide revenues for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes, with the recommendation that the Senate amendments be concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RICHARDSON. All points of order on the bill are reserved, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] reserves all points of order on the bill.

REVIEW OF THE WORLD'S COMMERCE FOR 1899.

Mr. HEATWOLE. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Printing to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate concurrent resolution No. 31.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, by direction of the Committee on Printing, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which the Clerk will report.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 14,000 copies of the general summary entitled Review of the World's Commerce for the year 1899, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 3,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 10,000 for the use of the Department of State; and 8,000 copies of Commercial Relations of the United States for the year 1899, including the general summary, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of the Senate, 2,000 for the use of the House of Representatives, and 5,000 for the use of the Department of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

YEARBOOK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FOR 1899.

Mr. HEATWOLE. I am further directed by the Committee on Printing to ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution No. 77.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, by the same authority, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there be printed of part 2 of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for 1899, issued in accordance with section 73, paragraph 2, chapter 23, Statutes at Large, 1895, issued under the title of "Yearbook of the United States Department of Agriculture," a special edition of 5,000 copies, on sized and supercalendered paper, to be bound in best quality of book cloth, subject to the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture, for distribution abroad, and especially during the Universal Exposition at Paris, 1900, to agricultural, educational, and other public and scientific foreign institutions and libraries and to public men especially engaged in work beneficial to agriculture: Provided, That in the distribution of this edition abroad, paragraph 79 of said section 73, of chapter 23, volume 28, Statutes at Large, 1895, is hereby suspended.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HEATWOLE, a motion to reconsider the several votes was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 7433. An act making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 8876. An act granting the right of way to the Minnesota and Manitoba Railroad Company across the ceded portion of the Chippewa (Red Lake) Indian Reservation, in Minnesota.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 9284. An act to attach the county of Foard, in the State of Texas, to the Fort Worth division of the northern district of Texas, and provide that all process issued against defendants residing in said county shall be returned to Fort Worth; and

H. R. 60. An act to create the northwestern division of the northern district of Georgia for judicial purposes and to fix the time and place for holding court therein.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 2581. An act to incorporate the National White Cross of America, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2493. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patents for land in certain cases—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2883. An act to change the characteristic of Cape Cod light, Massachusetts—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 2924. An act to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building thereon at Colorado Springs, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 3430. An act to increase the efficiency of the Subsistence Department of the United States Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3616. An act to authorize the payment of traveling allowances to enlisted men of the regular and volunteer forces when discharged by order of the Secretary of War and stated by him as entitled to travel pay—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

NICARAGUA CANAL.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill 2538 and the report. It is the bill providing for the Isthmian Canal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill 2538, and also of the report. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON. What is the title of the bill, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. HEPBURN. A bill providing for the construction of a canal to connect the waters of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans. The present edition of the bill has been entirely exhausted.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, pending the request for unanimous consent, I should like to ask the gentleman

a question. Is it the purpose of the gentleman to bring this bill up for consideration during the present session of this Congress?

Mr. HEPBURN. That, you know, the gentleman from Iowa can not answer. He can say that it is his purpose to bring this bill up if he can.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. Well, Mr. Speaker, I should like to know what is the purpose of the gentleman's colleagues?

Mr. HEPBURN. I will refer the gentleman from Kentucky to my colleagues.

Mr. WHEELER of Kentucky. I have no objection to a reprint of the bill, but it does seem to me unnecessary unless we are going to consider the bill. I feel warranted in saying that there is no objection to the consideration of it on this side, and I think the gentleman ought to give the House some information as to what his ultimate intentions are with regard to the consideration of the measure.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky knows as well as I that no individual member can state whether a bill will be considered by this House or not. All I can say is that if I can effect that consideration it will be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for a reprint of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

SIoux CITY AND PACIFIC RAILROAD.

Mr. POWERS (when the Committee on Pacific Railroads was called). Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business on this call is with the Committee on Pacific Railroads—on the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad bill.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the House before for consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont has fifteen minutes reserved of his time.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TALBERT. As I understood, on yesterday when the House adjourned we had under consideration the agricultural appropriation bill, under the five-minute rule, and my idea was that that business was to be resumed this morning and continued until 1 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. That is hardly a point of order; but the Chair not seeing the chairman of the committee in the House, could not keep the House waiting, and of course the next thing was a call of the committees.

Mr. POWERS. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the bill provides for the appointment of a commission consisting of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Attorney-General, and the Secretary of the Interior, to settle the indebtedness in favor of the Government against the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, which amounts in round numbers to about \$4,000,000. The Committee on Pacific Railroads presents this as a unanimous report, and urges it upon the House for many reasons, principal among which are the facts that a like commission succeeded in settling the indebtedness of the Union Pacific and of the Central Pacific railroads, to the great satisfaction of the people of this country, and we believe that this commission will realize more money out of this indebtedness than any other tribunal that can be provided.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] such time as he may need in the discussion of this question.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman or the Chair a question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I would like to ask the Chair if I could be recognized in opposition; and if so, for how long a time would I be entitled to the floor—an hour?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who antagonized the bill, has thirty minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, well, that is satisfactory.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, I believe when this matter was last under consideration, the discussion then being had was upon an amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. That amendment, as I now remember, was a provision requiring a report of the action of the commission to the House of Representatives. I am opposed to that amendment. I do not believe it would be effective of any good result; and I know of no sufficient reason why the matter should not be determined by this commission. This is the same commission that has been in existence heretofore, with an interest much greater than this. The action of that commission met the approval of every man in the country. It resulted in the securing of every dollar claimed by the United States. I

know of no reason now why that commission would be less efficient than on the other occasion.

I know if this matter comes back to the House, it will simply be a source of controversy, and there will probably be no decisive action by the House; and if there is, from the very nature of the subject, it will not have been so studied by the House and its membership as will enable them to have ideas correct and proper upon the subject. It is simply a postponement without the possibility of benefit. I have been a member of the Committee on Pacific Railroads for many years. I know that the members of this committee study these questions. I know that there are but few of the other members of the House that do. They are intricate. They require time; they require study; they require an effort upon the part of the membership of the House that they have not time to give to them, nor the inclination; and therefore I am opposed to that amendment.

The road is not an important one. It was 101 miles in length. It runs from the city of Sioux City down 40 miles southward to a connection with the Northwestern Road and then goes about 30 miles, and in that way forms a portion of that great railway system. That portion of the track, some 30 miles in length, is important. The other is inconsequential. It is paralleled on both sides by other roads. In the hands of any other corporation than the Northwestern Road it would be of little value. As a part of that system, however, it is able to earn 6 per cent on a valuation of \$24,000 a mile. It would not be valuable to any other system that I have any knowledge of.

Now, there are reasons why the people of Sioux City are desirous that this settlement should be made at an early day, and the entire business community of that city has petitioned to Congress for a settlement at once and in the manner provided in this bill. The other reason is that they want an additional connection by another line of this road that gives them a more direct eastern outlet. The Northwestern Road very naturally does not propose to make that connection, to improve to a certain extent this property, until they know who is to have the ownership, they having now but a lease. Therefore I believe the whole delegation from my State approve of this, and all the members of this House, too, from districts contiguous to the line approve of it; I believe it will be absolutely fair; that the United States will get the largest possible sum due to it, and therefore I hope the bill will pass without amendment. It has also been recommended unanimously by the Senate committee corresponding to our own.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] has eight minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] has thirty minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, I think that a bill providing for the settlement of the differences between the Government and this railroad company is wise and proper. I do think, however, that there ought to be an amendment to this bill, and with that amendment the bill would be a much better measure.

This railroad, as I understand it, is not a railroad that is impetuous or bankrupt. I find from the report of the Commissioner of Railroads for 1899 that the net earnings of that road for the year ending June 30, 1899, were \$189,771.68; the net earnings for the year ending June 30, 1898, were \$167,050.74, and the net earnings of the road for the year ending June 30, 1897, were \$94,801.89. These earnings show that the road has gotten into a very prosperous condition and is now yielding a large revenue upon the investment. The \$189,771.68 revenue for last year is sufficient to pay annually 3½ per cent upon the entire indebtedness of the road, including the indebtedness to the United States, principal and interest. A road that can show a net earning of 3½ per cent upon the entire indebtedness can not be considered as a bankrupt road, and I believe that the Government, by proper amendment that can be made to this bill, can get out of this railroad company every dollar of the indebtedness due to the Government.

The bill, I have no doubt, was reported by the committee in the utmost good faith. I have no doubt but what they have reported a bill that they thought guarded all the points, but I want to call attention to the fact that there is nothing in this bill that permits competition in the settlement of that indebtedness, and that is the one thing that I think ought to be included, and which is included in the amendment which I shall offer at the proper time.

Mr. SHATTUC. I should like to ask the gentleman if there is anything in the bill that prevents competition?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think there is, impliedly.

Mr. SHATTUC. I wish the gentleman would point it out.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think that the committee intended to cover it, but failed.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does the gentleman think the commission would not take into consideration all of the elements of competition?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I do not know what might be in the minds of the commission.

Mr. SHATTUC. Does not the gentleman think they did pretty well with the other roads?

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but you had a clause limiting the commission in making that settlement—that it should not accept a settlement for less than the principal and interest—and it obtained in that settlement principal and interest. But this bill only authorizes the commission to settle with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company; it does not authorize a settlement or sale of the mortgage; it does not authorize the commission to accept or receive propositions for any other person or corporation; it practically puts the commission at the mercy of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, or of whatever corporation owns and controls the majority of the stock thereof.

Now, I find that running into Sioux City there are four trunk lines, neither of which has a direct line to Omaha, Nebr. They are the Chicago and Northwestern, which company now owns a majority of the stock of the present Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company; the Great Northern Railroad enters Sioux City; the Illinois Central enters the city, and the Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul also enters that city. There is no direct route from Sioux City to Omaha except by this line, which the Government holds the mortgage on. It is likely that every one of these railroad companies wants a direct line to Omaha. There are other ways of reaching Omaha, but they are circuitous. This route does not extend all the way to Omaha, but it extends, I think, some 70 miles in that direction, and consequently you can readily see that there are four corporations that ought naturally to compete for this road.

Now, the amendment which I propose, and which I shall offer at the proper time, will make the bill read as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General of the United States are hereby authorized and empowered to make settlement and adjustment [with] of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company's [of its] indebtedness to the Government of the United States—

I have inserted "of" instead of "with" and have stricken out "of its" in the next line; and here is what I wish to insert—

and to that end may receive and determine upon any proposition from said Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, or from any other person or persons, corporation or corporations, or may sell or assign the mortgage given by said company to the United States and do any and all things proper and necessary to effect such settlement and adjustment and secure to the United States the largest possible sum in the payment of said indebtedness up to the full amount thereof.

I do not see how anyone can object to that amendment. It gives a broader scope to the commission. It permits them to receive bids from any other person or corporation that may want the road; and inasmuch as there are trunk lines that enter Sioux City, and inasmuch as this is the only direct route to Omaha, it seems to me that there should be four competitors for that road. These four competitors would naturally bring the price to be received by the Government to the highest amount obtainable.

I will show why, under this bill, the commissioners could not take into consideration the propositions of any other company. The bill reads as follows:

That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General of the United States are hereby authorized and empowered to make settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company of its indebtedness to the United States.

It will be seen that under this provision this commission is to make settlement with that company. It does not leave the commission open to receive bids from any other company or person who might be interested and might want to become a purchaser of that railroad. The amendment will open the field, will give broader scope to the commission, will permit them to receive bids, will permit them to sell the mortgage of the Government, and under this broad authority the commissioners may get out of this railroad the highest amount which the Government could possibly receive under the circumstances.

This road consists of a north and south line from Sioux City to California Junction, and there it branches westward. The part of the road which lies in Iowa consists of 70 miles north and south and 10 miles going westward to the bridge across the Missouri River. The report of the State railroad commissioner of Iowa says that the earnings of this company per mile in Iowa, where all the north and south part of the road is located, amount to \$5,008.36 net per mile. That is the revenue for last year. It further says that of the roads existing in Iowa this road ranks eighth in point of net revenue per mile; in other words, there are only 7 roads in Iowa that yield greater returns per mile for the operation of their roads in that State than this part of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad. It will thus be seen that this is not an insolvent road.

Mr. SHATTUC. Would not those figures be accessible to the gentlemen of the commission? Is it not to be assumed that they will take into consideration all such matters?

Mr. SHAFROTH. I think they will try to get at all the facts;

but my objection is, that this bill seems to permit a settlement with this road only. The language, as I have already quoted it, is that the commissioners "are hereby authorized and empowered to make settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company of its indebtedness to the United States;" whereas the amendment which I advocate will permit a settlement not only with the Sioux City and Pacific road, but with any other company or person that may want to compete for the ownership of the same.

Mr. SHATTUC. It is not mandatory that the commissioners should make settlement with this road only.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Oh, no, it is not; but if the act of Congress tells the commissioners that they are authorized to make settlement with this company, and if they are not expressly authorized to receive bids from anyone else, the result would naturally be that if the commissioners deemed it advisable to dispose of the property to some other company they would have to come to Congress for new legislation, which would involve delay. Under these circumstances the commissioners might feel disposed to take a much less sum than if they were permitted to close a settlement with anybody who might want to buy the road.

Mr. SHATTUC. Has the gentleman any idea that the commissioners would take less from the Chicago and Northwestern road than from any other line?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. POWERS. If the gentleman from Colorado will send up his amendment, I will accept it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. The chairman of the committee says that he will accept this amendment. With the amendment the bill will be perfectly satisfactory to me.

The Clerk read the bill as proposed to be amended by Mr. SHAFROTH, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General of the United States are hereby authorized and empowered to make settlement and adjustment of the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company's indebtedness to the Government of the United States; and to that end may receive and determine upon any proposition or propositions from said Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company or from any other person or persons, corporation or corporations, and may sell or assign the mortgage given by said company to the United States and do any and all things proper and necessary to effect such settlement and adjustment, and secure to the United States the largest sum possible in the payment of said indebtedness up to the full amount thereof: *Provided,* That they deem the same for the best interests of the Government; and when such settlement is approved by the President it shall become operative, and the Attorney-General shall make the necessary acquittances to said railroad company.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, when we had this Pacific Railroad bill up before, the same policy was assumed in this House as at present. The fact is, the committee ran down our property; they seemed to think it was of little value and tried to push through bills here which would force a settlement out of which the Government would get practically nothing. We happened to have in this House at that time, as a Representative, Mr. HARRIS, of Kansas, now a Senator. He was a civil engineer by profession, and he had helped build the different lines of this road, had accepted much of it, and knew its whole history. When he took the floor the time for debate was very much limited, but by unanimous consent the limitation was removed, and he held the floor by the hour. His advice was taken. Now, when we had this matter up before, I was referring to that gentleman and to his work in securing a settlement that surprised us all. After our former controversy over this bill I dropped him a note and received a reply which I would like to have read in my time.

Mr. POWERS. That is not regular.

Mr. BELL. Why not?

Mr. POWERS. This is from a Senator.

Mr. BELL. I will read it myself. I ask the page to bring back the letter, if the gentleman from Vermont is going to object. He seems to be afraid of information.

Mr. POWERS. I am not afraid of information, but I submit—

Mr. BELL. Bring the letter back. I do not want my time consumed.

Mr. POWERS. I submit it is not in order to put into the proceedings of the House a statement by a gentleman who is a member of the Senate. He can express his views in the Senate.

Mr. BELL. But I have asked to have this read as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The Chair understands the gentleman to have withdrawn the article.

Mr. BELL. I asked, Mr. Speaker, and I now ask, to have it read in my time from the desk. It is a letter from a Senator, and is an expression of his individual views upon the question presented by this bill.

Mr. POWERS. And I submit, Mr. Speaker, that he may only make his argument in the other body. He is a member of the Senate and may present his views there. He should not submit them to the members of the House to influence legislation here.

Mr. BELL. Senator HARRIS shows in this letter some facts which are important. It is not his action in the Senate, but simply his private views.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would have to examine the article itself in order to form an idea as to whether it would be admissible under the point of order made by the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. BELL. I will read it myself as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman proceeding to quote from the Senator in open Senate?

Mr. BELL. No, Mr. Speaker; I am quoting from a letter from Senator HARRIS addressed to myself personally.

The SPEAKER. But the point of order is made against the reading of the article in the House.

Mr. BELL. Under a misapprehension, I think. This is a private letter—a personal matter, addressed to myself. It is not the action of Senator HARRIS in the Senate, and has no connection with his action as a Senator. It is a personal letter to myself. I asked him for some information upon this question, and he responded in this personal letter to me which I propose to read.

The SPEAKER. Does this purport to be a speech from the Senator in open Senate?

Mr. BELL. Oh, no; only his individual views on a question relating to the settlement of this controversy, addressed to myself in response to an inquiry. It has nothing to do with the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will proceed, on his statement that this language was not uttered in the Senate.

Mr. BELL. I hope this interruption does not come out of my time.

Senator HARRIS says:

In this whole matter from the beginning we have had the singular spectacle of officers and representatives of the Government holding the claim against property, having the apparently determined effort to depreciate its value and to accept only the valuation put upon it by the very parties most interested in undervaluation. In the Union Pacific and Central Pacific the facts ultimately worked out to show the absolute folly of this position.

Now, I wish to show you exactly what this means. Senator HARRIS insisted that this was not the proper way to deal with the matter; that the bill under consideration ought to be amended, for the report of these officers comes back to Congress, the power from which it emanated; and because if we have this bill to be approved by the President, he, in the multifarious duties of his office, cannot possibly look personally into the question for himself, but must get his information from the Attorney-General, who is a member of the commission itself, and is equivalent to having no approval of it at all on the part of the Executive. Now, we know that the President has not the time to get at the bottom facts in a case of this kind. He must take the advice of his subordinates. The Attorney-General is a member of the commission, and therefore the report should be approved by Congress, from which their power originated.

Senator HARRIS continues:

And the same thing would have been true on the Kansas Pacific. * * * I inclose you a report which I made last year on this subject, by which it is clearly shown that the average net receipts for four full years—1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896—on the 100 miles of road was over \$129,000. This is taken from the reports of the railroad commissions, and is absolutely net earnings. This certainly shows that the 100 miles might be valued at \$3,500,000 or \$4,000,000, and would certainly justify the payment at the Government of the face value of the bonds (\$1,600,000).

But this road has a valuable bridge across the Missouri River—

And I wish to call your special attention to this point—

But this road has a valuable bridge across the Missouri River, and if you will examine the original acts you will find in all cases Congress required the construction of a continuous line of road; and in the Omaha Bridge case, where the company attempted to have the bridge released from the Government lien, the Supreme Court decided that the continuous line of road from the initial point to the terminus must include the bridge, and decided that the bridge was subject to the Government lien. This case is in no way different except that the railroad company was authorized to permit a separate corporation, which was one and the same thing under another name, to construct the bridge, and it is an absurdity to suppose that the Government ever contemplated the construction of two detached pieces of road with a bridge of another corporation separating and disconnecting the two pieces.

I think this is a point upon which we should have a decision of the Supreme Court. * * * If this bridge is, as I believe it is, covered by the Government lien, there is no question but what we should have the whole amount of the Government indebtedness, \$4,200,000. If it is not, we ought to get the face value of the bonds. I think by all means the amount which the commission should accept should be specified, as was the case in the Central Pacific.

Now, we specified the amount that must be received in all former bills—

where the commission was absolutely required to obtain the whole amount of the debt due the United States, and was limited to ten years with semi-annual payments, with 3 per cent interest, as the terms upon which it should be paid. You will find that we added this requirement to the commission bill, and it was on the general deficiency bill of June 30, 1893, page 8. * * *

Now, that bill passed through this House with the committee itself depreciating this property and saying that it was of no value to the Government of the United States; but the Senate put on the bill a provision, and insisted that we must have the amount

of the debt or there could be no settlement, and they walked right up and paid the bill.

The Union Pacific was settled, as you remember, through the courts by invoking public sentiment to compel the Attorney-General to either accept full payment or obtain a postponement until Congress could act.

If you remember, there was a great cry by the newspapers from New York and everywhere that this property was going to be sacrificed, and forced a settlement.

Either one of two things should be insisted upon—the full amount should be obtained or the settlement referred back to Congress for approval.

Now, we thought that amendment ought to go in. If they get the full amount of our claim, let them settle. If they do not get the full amount of the claim, let them send it back to us, from whom they got their authority, for our approval or disapproval.

Of course I need not comment on that part of the House report which speaks of the debt as a payment of principal and accrued interest, when, in fact, the interest was advanced by the Government owing to the default of the company, and the interest is as much a part of the principal debt as the face of the bonds.

The interest mentioned here is interest that we paid on the bonds.

The report of the Chicago and Northwestern Railway Company to the Interstate Commerce Commission for the year ending June 30, 1898, shows that the dividends for that year on the bridge amounted to \$1,488,000. Other years were much less, but we understand how unreliable railroad reports are, but in this case they seem to have been forced to acknowledge the tremendous income derived from the bridge.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I have offered and which is pending is a very simple one. It is to require the commission appointed by this bill to report back to Congress the settlement at which it shall arrive, for the approval or the disapproval of that body.

In the discussion of the question when it was up here before, some little difference of opinion arose between me and the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. POWERS] and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN], which grew out of the assertion on the part of one of them that what was wanted in this bill was to settle the debt by a commission, "in the same way in which the debts of the other land-grant aided roads had been settled." I then said that my recollection was that this was not at all the same settlement; but concluding that they had been more familiar with the details of Pacific Railroad legislation than I, I was disposed to concede that they were right and I probably wrong.

I have looked into the matter since that time, however, and I find that I was right. The Union Pacific debt was settled in the course of court proceedings, after there was an attempt made to foreclose. No commission had anything in the world to do with the settlement of the Union Pacific debt. And yet, without a commission, we procured from that railroad every dollar which they owed the Government of the United States, except, I believe, upon the Kansas Pacific branch, where we got a compromise. On the balance we got the principal of the debt and the interest, treated as interest, not upon the theory of treating our payment of their interest on their bonds as principal, as might, perhaps, have been done theoretically.

Now, I find this, Mr. Speaker, that when we came to settle the Central Pacific and the Western Pacific we inserted this language in the act which created the commission for the settlement of our claim:

That said commission shall not agree to accept a less sum in settlement of the amount due to the United States than the full amount of principal and interest, and all amounts necessary to reimburse the United States for moneys paid for interest or otherwise.

Now, I would have offered that amendment to this bill but for the fact that I did not feel assured in my own mind that that would be right and proper in this particular case. I do not know enough about it to know whether it is possible to get the full principal and interest.

But I do want this commission to get all it can get, and I read this to show that you are not bringing to this House a bill on all fours with the previous legislation creating commissions for the settlement of the Pacific Railroad debts. The act in case of Central Pacific and Western Pacific railroads also had another proviso:

Provided further, That unless the settlement herein authorized be perfected within one year after the passage of this act, the President of the United States shall at once proceed to foreclose all liens now held by the United States against said railroad companies and to collect the indebtedness herein sought to be settled, and nothing in this act contained shall be held to waive, etc.

In other words, you not only provided there that the commission should not accept a dollar less than the principal and interest, but provided that if they did not settle in one year the President should proceed in a court procedure to foreclose; and it was not until they were ready to put the spurs of the law into their flanks that they did settle, and then they settled by giving us everything which was due. Now, gentlemen will remember when the settlement of these other railroad debts was up for discussion—and in the case of the Union Pacific we did not appoint a

commission—that the best-informed men of this House said it was altogether absurd to think of getting the value of the debt of these roads. They said that the part subject to our liens had not any termini, that they could not go into San Francisco, could not cross the Omaha bridge, and that we could not get anything.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit me right there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. In line with what the gentleman from Mississippi suggests, I wish by way of corroboration to say that I was on the Committee on Pacific Railroads in the Fifty-third Congress when the settlement of this commission came up. Those who advocated what may be termed the railroad interests said just what the gentleman from Mississippi has stated—that the Government of the United States would never recover anything, some ready debaters stating that at the end of a hundred years' litigation the Government of the United States might possibly recover \$10,000,000, but the majority of them thought nothing at all, no matter how protracted the litigation. I was on the minority.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. That is true. They said that the first mortgage would take up the whole railroad.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And they proved it by the figures.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And they proved it by the figures. That is a sort of excuse for using some figures in connection with this road, and I quote from a minority report signed by Senators MORGAN, RAWLINS, HARRIS, in the Senate of the United States. I find that the net earnings for the years 1893, 1894, 1895, and 1896 of this line were:

1893	\$132,845.73
1894	157,247.71
1895	120,542.61
1896	106,764.93

Total for four years	517,400.98
Average for four years	129,350.24

The average of the net earnings for the last four years, amounting to the sum of \$129,350.24, we believe indicates clearly that the value of the property on a basis of 4 per cent is considerably in excess of the sum of \$3,000,000.

What is the debt? They owe us, of principal, \$1,628,320; interest, \$2,612,383, making a total of \$4,240,703.

Now, I understand there is a tacit understanding or agreement, or rather a coming together of minds, to the effect that \$1,000,000 would be a satisfactory settlement with these people.

I do not think so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in addition to that, I want to call attention to the matter of this bridge, which was mentioned by the gentleman from Colorado. Here is a bridge that was built under a charter granted to the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad. I am informed that the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, the president of which, I understand, is also the president of this road, has reported that this bridge earned in the year ending June 30 \$1,400,000.

Now, they contend that the Government can not foreclose on the bridge; that the Government has no lien on it. They made that contention in the case of the Omaha bridge on the Union Pacific, and in 91 United States Supreme Court Reports that case was decided, and the court decided that the Government could fasten its lien upon that bridge; and upon what reasoning? For the reason that the act provided that the corporation was to build "a continuous line of road," and they could not be heard to say that the Omaha bridge they traveled over was not a part of their road, since it had to be in order to be "a continuous road."

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentleman will see that this bridge is not a part of the road.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Oh, yes; a part of the railroad who built the bridge, in effect, by assignment of the charter rights.

Mr. HEPBURN. Who does the gentleman give as authority for the statement that they were to build a continuous line of road?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The charter which enabled them to use the money, as I understand, was to build a continuous line of road between certain termini. I think that is the case with all the Pacific aided roads; that the charters used that language.

Mr. HEPBURN. It is not built upon the line contemplated in the charter. It was a diversion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I understand that.

Mr. HEPBURN. After legislation; and it is not connected in any way at its southern terminus with the Pacific Railroad, except as another company—not the Pacific Railroad—built a portion. It is not connected with the Pacific system.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg the gentleman's pardon. The Congress of the United States granted a charter for the construction of the Sioux City and Pacific Rail-

road, and later a charter to erect this bridge. It also granted in that charter, in which the grantees were the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad, a right to the railroad to assign that charter, and the contention is that they had the right to assign it so as to take the bridge, when built by the assignees, out from under the lien of the United States. Then our contention is that, notwithstanding the right of assignment, the assignment must be subject to the equities of the United States as shown to exist in the railroad charter and in the bridge charter.

Mr. POWERS. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi is partly right and partly wrong. The Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company had a charter granted by the Iowa legislature, and authorized the building from Sioux City to a connection with the Union Pacific, and it could only be done by building across this river to some point in Nebraska, and then Congress, as the gentleman states, afterwards authorized it to build this bridge.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Yes; Congress afterwards came to its aid, passed a bill in aid of the construction of a railway, with bonds, lands, etc., and in the act they provided that they should build a continuous line of railway between certain points. In connection with the bridge, the grantee in the charter to erect the bridge was the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, and the only ground upon which they claim exemption is that in the same charter they were granted the right to assign the bridge charter, and they claim that the right to assign the power to construct the bridge carried with it an exemption of the bridge from the claims of the United States Government. Now, we deny that. The Omaha Bridge case was not exactly on all fours with this, but in many respects similar to it, and the United States Supreme Court decided that case in favor of the Government and against the railroad.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Has the time of the gentleman from Mississippi fully expired, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. It has; and one minute more.

Mr. POWERS. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LIVINGSTON].

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Speaker, do I understand the amendment that I have offered has been accepted by the committee.

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I undertake to say, Mr. Speaker, that if the House wants a settlement and an adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company, that the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado clearly protects the Government, and ought to be adopted. It gives to the commission, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Attorney-General all the competition that possibly can be had in negotiating a settlement. Now, the only question is, Do we want a settlement; do we want the matter adjusted? And if so, the amendment of the gentleman ought to be accepted. I have grave doubts about the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] that the report of the commission should come back to the House.

There is no telling when that would be ended or concluded. If you have any confidence in the Attorney-General, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of the Treasury, guarded as it is by the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado, you had better let them have the full power to close up the bids under these restrictions and with these privileges. If it comes back here, the party with whom they negotiate will feel as though it never may be concluded. It may be in a year, and it may be in five years, and perhaps it will not be accepted at all; or it may be slightly amended and sent back and kept traveling backward and forward for many years. No party or parties would like to be held down to a settlement thus handicapped.

Mr. TERRY. Why should we give this commission more power in this case than we have ever done in any similar case?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I think the gentleman from Arkansas did not listen to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado or he would not have asked that question.

Mr. TERRY. I not only listened to it carefully, but I asked the gentleman about it afterwards. It does not say that they shall get the full amount of the debt—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I know it does not. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] covered that in his suggestion that perhaps it would be unwise to limit the commission in that respect.

Mr. TERRY. And there is no provision in the gentleman's amendment that the commission shall report back to Congress, and you are against that.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I am arguing against its coming back to Congress, because if you instruct the commission as is provided in the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado, there is no good reason, in my humble opinion, in making them report back to Congress to have a wrangle over it for months and years, and

perhaps afterwards defeat the whole negotiation by reference to Congress.

Mr. TERRY. But this amendment proposed by the gentleman from Colorado—

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time to the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman declines to yield to me for a further question?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. No.

Mr. TERRY. Well, I call attention to the fact that the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado does not limit this commission as to the amount for which they shall settle; they can take one-half of the debt due the Government; and then it does not provide that they shall report back to Congress.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. They are limited in that respect, and the reason is the House is not clearly settled in its mind as to what can be done or ought to be done.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman think that, if the proposed settlement is reported back to Congress, together with the data upon which they base their conclusions, Congress will be in possession of sufficient information to better judge of it?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Perhaps they would.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. For that reason I want it to come back.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Yes; and then comes the question whether we want a settlement or not. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three and one-half minutes.

Mr. POWERS. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. THOMAS] who introduced this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the general provisions of this bill and the necessity for its passage have, I think, been pretty fully discussed by a number of gentlemen who have preceded me. I shall direct my remarks entirely to the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS].

I believe it to be wholly impracticable to attempt to create this commission and then hedge them about with a limitation as provided for by this amendment. The indebtedness against this road is now about \$58,000 per mile, or a little less than that. Now, it is evident that this railroad could be paralleled for very much less. With the information before the House we are not in a position at the present time to attempt to place such limitation upon this commission. We might just as well authorize the commission to receive bids for the settlement with this road, and to authorize it to confer with the several railroad companies that might feel inclined to bid, and then report to the House the best bid offered.

It amounts to nothing more than authorizing the commission to receive bids, without any authority or power whatever to negotiate with any of the companies upon a plan of settlement. The bill as it now stands, without the amendment, gives to the commission power, with the approval of the President, to confer with the several railroad companies that may desire to obtain control of the road and settle the indebtedness to the Government on the best terms obtainable. And with the experience before us of the settlement of the claims of the Government against the other Pacific railroads, I feel assured that we make no mistake in investing this commission with full power to make settlement of the Government's claim, subject to the approval of the President.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, the proposition of this bill, as it now stands with the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado, is practically the same proposition that was adopted in the case of the Central Pacific Railroad, with the exception that in that case the commission was directed to require full payment of the indebtedness. Now, here is a case about which there is a great deal of question whether we can secure the full indebtedness. But we refer the matter to this independent tribunal who have possession of all the papers in the Department and who have experts at their command who can investigate the whole matter and do precisely as we directed the commissioners to do in the case of the Central Pacific.

In that case we adopted a settlement without any reference back to Congress; and if this proposition had been put upon that bill, it never would have passed this House. The House would then have said, as I expect it will say now, that if Congress is to settle the question it might as well settle it now, without going through the farce of referring it to a jury for determination and then requiring the jury to refer it back to us for our decision. Now, if there is nothing further to be said, I call for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is first on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments may be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

In line 8, after the word "States," insert the words "Provided, That they deem the same for the best interests of the Government."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 10, strike out the word "President" and insert "the Congress of the United States."

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, there were—yeas 67, noes 69.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I call for the yeas and nays on this question.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 93, nays 109, answered "present" 12, not voting 136; as follows:

YEAS—93.

Adamson,	Driggs,	McDowell,	Sparkman.
Allen, Ky.	Finley,	McRae,	Spight,
Atwater,	Fitzgerald, N. Y.	Maddox,	Stark,
Ball,	Fitzpatrick,	Mann,	Stephens, Tex.
Barber,	Fleming,	Meekison,	Stokes,
Bell,	Gaines,	Moon,	Sulzer,
Benton,	Gilbert,	Needham,	Sutherland,
Brantley,	Glynn,	Newlands,	Swanson,
Breazeale,	Griffith,	Pierce, Tenn.	Talbert,
Brewer,	Hay,	Quarles,	Tate,
Brundidge,	Henry, Conn.	Rhea, Ky.	Terry,
Burnett,	Henry, Miss.	Rhea, Va.	Thomas, N. C.
Campbell,	Howard,	Richardson,	Underhill,
Chanler,	Jett,	Riordan,	Underwood,
Clark, Mo.	Jones, Va.	Robinson, Ind.	Wheeler, Ky.
Clayton, Ala.	Kleberg,	Robinson, Nebr.	Williams, J. R.
Clayton, N. Y.	Kluttz,	Rucker,	Williams, Miss.
Cusack,	Latimer,	Ruppert,	Wilson, Idaho
Cushman,	Lester,	Ryan, N. Y.	Wilson, N. Y.
De Armond,	Little,	Shackelford,	Wilson, S. C.
De Vries,	Lloyd,	Sims,	Ziegler.
Denny,	McClellan,	Snodgrass,	
Dinsmore,	McCulloch,		
Dougherty,			

NAYS—109.

Adams,	Eddy,	Lanham,	Russell,
Aldrich,	Emerson,	Linney,	Shattuc,
Allen, Me.	Fletcher,	Littlefield,	Shelden,
Bailey, Kans.	Fordney,	Livingston,	Sheppard,
Barham,	Foss,	Long,	Sherman,
Bartholdt,	Gardner, Mich.	Lorimer,	Sibley,
Bingham,	Gibson,	Loud,	Smith, Ill.
Boutell, Ill.	Gill,	Loudenslager,	Smith, H. C.
Eowersock,	Gillett, Mass.	Lovring,	Smith, Samuel W.
Eromwell,	Graft,	McCleary,	Smith, Wm. Alden
Brosius,	Graham,	McPherson,	Spaulding,
Brown,	Grosvenor,	Marsh,	Sperry,
Bull,	Grow,	Mercer,	Steele,
Burleigh,	Hamilton,	Metcalf,	Stevens, Minn.
Burton,	Haugen,	Miers, Ind.	Stewart, Wis.
Butler,	Heatwole,	Miller,	Sulloway,
Cannon,	Hedge,	Moody, Mass.	Thomas, Iowa
Capron,	Hepburn,	Moody, Oreg.	Tompkins,
Clarke, N. H.	Hill,	Morris,	Tongue,
Corliss,	Hoffecker,	Noonan,	Vreeland,
Cousins,	Hopkins,	O'Grady,	Wadsworth,
Cromer,	Howell,	Payne,	Wanger,
Crump,	Jones, Wash.	Pearce, Mo.	Waters,
Crumpacker,	Joy,	Phillips,	Weaver,
Curtis,	Ketcham,	Powers,	White.
Dalzell,	Lacey,	Prince,	
Davidson,	Lane,	Pugh,	
Dolliver,		Reeder,	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—12.

Bartlett,	Connell,	Gordon,	Mahon,
Brownlow,	Cowherd,	Hall,	Norton, S. C.
Burleson,	Gaston,	McAleer,	Packer, Pa.

NOT VOTING—136.

Acheson,	Cochrane, N. Y.	Fox,	Lewis,
Alexander,	Cooney,	Freer,	Littauer,
Allen, Miss.	Cooper, Tex.	Gamble,	Lybrand,
Babcock,	Cooper, Wis.	Gardner, N. J.	McCall,
Bailey, Tex.	Cox,	Gayle,	McLain,
Baker,	Crawford,	Gillet, N. Y.	May,
Bankhead,	Crowley,	Green, Pa.	Mesick,
Barney,	Cummings,	Greene, Mass.	Meyer, La.
Bellamy,	Dahle, Wis.	Griggs,	Minor,
Berry,	Daly, N. J.	Hawley,	Mondell,
Bishop,	Davenport, S. A.	Hemenway,	Morgan,
Boreing,	Davenport, S. W.	Hitt,	Mudd,
Boutelle, Me.	Davey,	Hull,	Muller,
Bradley,	Davis,	Jack,	Naphe,
Brenner,	Dayton,	Jenkins,	Norton, Ohio
Brick,	De Graffenreid,	Johnston,	Olmsted,
Broussard,	Dick,	Kahn,	Otey,
Burke, S. Dak.	Dovener,	Kerr,	Otjen,
Burke, Tex.	Driscoll,	Kitchin,	Overstreet,
Burkett,	Elliott,	Knox,	Parker, N. J.
Calderhead,	Esch,	Lamb,	Pearre,
Caldwell,	Faris,	Landis,	Polk,
Carmack,	Fitzgerald, Mass.	Lawrence,	Ransdell,
Catchings,	Foster,	Lentz,	Ray,
Cochran, Mo.	Fowler,	Levy,	Reeves,

Ridgely,	Showalter,	Tawney,	Warner,
Rixey,	Slayden,	Taylor, Ohio	Watson,
Robb,	Small,	Taylor, Ala.	Weeks,
Robertson, La.	Smith, Ky.	Thayer,	Weymouth,
Rodenberg,	Southard,	Thropp,	Williams, W. E.
Salmon,	Sprague,	Turner,	Wise,
Scudder,	Stallings,	Vandiver,	Wright,
Shafroth,	Stewart, N. J.	Van Voorhis,	Young,
	Stewart, N. Y.	Wachter,	Zenor.

So the amendment was rejected.

The following pairs were announced until further notice:

Mr. SHOWALTER with Mr. NORTON of South Carolina.

Mr. CONNELL with Mr. STANLEY W. DAVENPORT.

Mr. LYBRAND with Mr. GASTON.

Mr. VAN VOORHIS with Mr. GORDON.

Mr. TAWNEY with Mr. COWHERD.

Mr. LANDIS with Mr. SCUDDER.

Mr. ESCH with Mr. SLAYDEN.

Mr. BROWNLOW with Mr. CARMACK.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. BURLESON.

Mr. ACHESON with Mr. CROWLEY.

Mr. GILLET with Massachusetts with Mr. THAYER.

Mr. DAHLE of Wisconsin with Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri.

Mr. HAWLEY with Mr. COOPER of Texas.

Mr. WEYMOUTH with Mr. BROUSSARD.

Mr. TAYLER of Ohio with Mr. FOX.

Mr. BURKETT with Mr. BURKE of Texas.

Mr. DAYTON with Mr. MEYER of Louisiana.

Mr. BROMWELL with Mr. McDOWELL.

Mr. MAHON with Mr. OTEY.

Mr. BARNEY with Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi.

Mr. MINOR with Mr. RIXEY.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BARTLETT.

For the session:

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania with Mr. POLK.

Mr. WRIGHT with Mr. HALL.

Mr. HULL with Mr. HAY.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey with Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania.

Until April 20:

Mr. OTJEN with Mr. BRENNER.

Until April 7:

Mr. ZENOR with Mr. FARIS.

For two weeks:

Mr. STEWART of New York with Mr. MITCHELL.

For one week:

Mr. WACHTER with Mr. SMALL.

Until Wednesday:

Mr. STEWART of New Jersey with Mr. MCALDER.

Mr. KERR with Mr. JOHNSON.

For this day:

Mr. OLMSTED with Mr. WILLIAM E. WILLIAMS.

Mr. LITAUER with Mr. GRIGGS.

Mr. YOUNG with Mr. RIDGELY.

Mr. THROPP with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DICK with Mr. DE GRAFFENREID.

Mr. JACK with Mr. BAILEY of Texas.

Mr. MONDELL with Mr. NORTON of Ohio.

Mr. PEARRE with Mr. LENTZ.

Mr. SOUTHARD with Mr. LEWIS.

Mr. MUDD with Mr. CALDWELL.

Mr. DOVENER with Mr. CATCHINGS.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded simply as "present."

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from New York, Mr. DRISCOLL, and desire to withdraw my vote and be marked "present."

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. VAN VOORHIS, and withdraw my vote and desire to be recorded as "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SHAFROTH].

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, that amendment has been accepted.

The SPEAKER. It is not in the power of the gentleman to accept an amendment when the matter is pending before the House. The vote will be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado.

The amendment of Mr. SHAFROTH was again reported, and agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. POWERS, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the Committee on Agriculture to move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion of my colleague from New York, I would like to ask unanimous consent that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill, and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York, that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments to the Indian appropriation bill and ask a conference on the disagreeing votes?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. LITTLE as conferees on the part of the House.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I now renew my motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the Agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. O'GRADY in the chair).

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House bill 10538.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, there are three amendments—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH (continuing). There are three amendments pending to the paragraph in the bill relating to publications of the Department of Agriculture, and I wish to address myself particularly to the one asking an increase in the appropriation of \$20,000 in that item.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that I was recognized?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I had not yielded the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. In regard to this proposed increase, I want to repeat what I said last evening. The amount appropriated by the bill is the amount estimated for by the Agricultural Department. It gives 5,000 bulletins to each member, and in the judgment of the Agricultural Department that is all that is necessary for the proper dissemination of useful agricultural information; and, as I said yesterday, whenever there is a bulletin that is particularly interesting to the agricultural industries of a district, the local press take it up and publish it, so that the information goes broadcast all over the country.

Now I want to read a paragraph in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture, on page 40, under the head of Farmers' bulletins:

Of the total number of copies of farmers' bulletins printed (2,437,000), Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress took only 1,100,985—

Now mark—

considerably less than last year and the year previous.

That shows that Congressmen and Senators and Delegates are not asking for these bulletins as they were in the past.

Under the law, when Senators, Representatives, and Delegates do not avail themselves of the entire number of copies of farmers' bulletins allotted to them, the same revert to the Department for miscellaneous institutions or for satisfying further Congressional orders. I am, therefore, able for the current year to increase the quota of farmers' bulletins allotted to members of Congress from 4,000 to 5,000.

In addition to this the committee have seen fit, on the recommendation of the Secretary to give him \$5,000 additional over the current year. This item of \$20,000 may be looked upon as a small increase, but I can see no reason why Congress should allow it. This thing was gone over pretty thoroughly yesterday afternoon, but I wanted to call particular attention to what the Secretary of Agriculture says in regard to the demand for bulletins, because that is the point that my friend from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] bore particularly upon.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. I make the point of order that debate on this paragraph is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to take up the time of the House in the discussion of this proposed amendment increasing the number of bulletins that members may have to send out to their constituents, but I stand here to speak for the people of my district, and I assume that there are other districts with demands similar to mine.

These experimental stations have been established at a great cost to the Government. In this bill we appropriate something like eight or nine hundred thousand dollars to be expended for

that purpose. Now, what is the object of that experimental work? Shall it be said that this experimentation shall be carried on and that the people shall know nothing of it? The object of these bulletins is that the people may be informed upon these subjects, and I know of no way in which the money could be so well expended. I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to say yesterday that he wanted to send out 35,000 copies to his district, and that he expected only 10 per cent of them to be read.

Mr. WADSWORTH. No, I did not say that. I said 90 per cent of them would be appreciated.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I was in error, but I understood the gentleman in that way. I see by the RECORD to-day he says that 90 per cent would be read. If 90 per cent of his 35,000 copies that he would like to send to his district would be read, then I say in all justice to the people of his district they should be furnished with those copies.

I was amused yesterday at the colloquy between my friend from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] and my other friend from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] on the cotton seed question. It was proposed to investigate the cotton seed and its products. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] called the attention of his colleague [Mr. SIMS] to the fact that that had already been done, and I find here among these bulletins one upon that subject. I commend that bulletin to the gentleman from Tennessee and to the gentleman from Mississippi, and I think they should give the people of their districts an opportunity to know something of what has been done on this subject.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. This gentleman has done that. He has sent out about a thousand copies of them to his district.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. It seems that results speak louder than words, because, although these copies have been sent out, the people do not seem to be informed on this subject.

Another thing: the gentleman from Mississippi says that when the people want these bulletins they call for them. They are like some members of Congress—they do not know that they are in existence. The farmers can not know that these bulletins are published until they see copies of them, and it is the duty of members of Congress to know what is to be had for the people of their districts, and to furnish the things that they want, and not wait until the people become informed on the subject and then send for the information. If we spend a million dollars for experimentation, I say it is but fair and proper and just that we should spend \$50,000 in carrying the results of that experimentation to the people. We have not time to discuss this question to-day as it should be discussed.

It so happens in the natural order of things that the gentleman on the other side, the chairman of this committee [Mr. WADSWORTH], and the gentleman on this side [Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi] have denied the members of this House an opportunity to discuss the amendment that we propose, and all that we can do is to get in a few remarks here under the five-minute rule. Yesterday when we wanted to discuss this, the gentleman said to us that if we wanted to discuss general political issues we could get time to burn, but that if we proposed to advocate any amendment to this bill there would not be one minute of time at our disposal.

Now, I wish, under the five-minute rule, to call attention briefly to the demands of the people on this subject, and I call attention here in these running, rambling remarks, so that you can understand something of this amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina. I speak for my district, that has 40,000 voters, 30,000 of whom would read every one of 50 copies of these bulletins, and I do your constituency the credit to believe that they would read them likewise if you sent them there. I believe that is true of every constituency. They want to be informed, and it is but right that this House should give them an opportunity to be informed, by sending the bulletins provided by this Department; and the pittance of \$57,000 is a very small amount to be appropriated for this purpose. I was taunted yesterday with demagoguery when I said that agriculture did not receive its proper consideration in this House.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LATIMER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be allowed to continue for five minutes.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Now, I repeat what I said on yesterday. What I said yesterday I say again to-day, and gentlemen who desire may give the "horselaugh" for the statement if they choose. There is a bill pending here now in this House, and favorably reported, to spend \$200,000 to send a commission to China to investigate the conditions there with reference to selling our manufactured goods; and yet of the exports from this country 75 per cent are from the farms. Still we can not have \$37,500 in order to make the agriculturists of this country familiar with the work that is carried on at the experimental stations provided at great cost to the taxpayers.

The gentleman from Mississippi assumes that when we send

one of these bulletins out we do it for the sinister purpose of getting a vote. I do not know what his motive is when he sends a bulletin to one of his constituents, but when I send one to a constituent of mine I send it out for no such base and ignoble purpose. I send it out not only that my friends may read it, but that they may obtain the best information upon these subjects that lie at the very foundation of this Government. This is the greatest agricultural country in the world, and our people are agriculturists, and he who would withhold from them anything that tends to give them more enlightenment upon their vocation is doing that which is injurious to the very principles of our great Government.

I say, then, Mr. Chairman, that this increase of \$20,000, making a total appropriation of \$57,000 for the publication of this literature, is too small, entirely too small; but we must do the best we can.

These gentlemen are holding us down with hard hands, and we will have to take just what we can get. But I believe the members of this House will see the justice of our proposed amendment and vote it accordingly.

The farmer is not sitting here asking for anything. He sends his representatives here to do what they think ought to be done in his behalf. To speak in that way is in no sense demagoguery, as was intimated yesterday when a gentleman said that he could make a farmer's speech. The farmer does not come here. He looks to his representative; and I say it is our duty to urge this amendment, and to urge all other similar propositions in his behalf. Now, as the time is up, I must stop. I would like to have had thirty minutes in which to discuss the bill itself, and not to discuss some general political subject that had nothing to do with it. I yield back to the gentleman from South Carolina any time not consumed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri may have thirty minutes to speak on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has been recognized.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose that there is no gentleman upon this floor who represents a better agricultural district than the one which I have the honor to represent, and during my entire Congressional career I have always voted for every measure which in my judgment was in the interest of the agriculturist. The Agricultural Department, now presided over by that distinguished gentleman, Secretary Wilson, was created during my service in this House; and I have seen that Department of the Government, that has now become so great in the distribution of information throughout the country, develop from year to year under appropriations that have been made by the different Congresses since its establishment. I am not, however, in favor of the amendment which is proposed here, which will take \$20,000 additional money out of the Treasury of the United States, and the reason that I am not in favor of it is that I believe it would be a waste of the money.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. In connection with what has just been said, let me say that a million of these pamphlets last year were unused; Members of Congress and Senators did not call for them.

Mr. HOPKINS. I was about to make the remark when interrupted by the gentleman from Mississippi that the record shows that the Agricultural Committee has in the past, as it has in this bill, made ample provision for these bulletins, so that every intelligent farmer of America could have one if he desired it; and my experience is—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. HOPKINS. I can not yield. My experience is that many of the farmers do not care for these bulletins, and for that reason we have found that appropriations made in the past have been sufficiently ample. Now, in the last Congress we made appropriation so that two million and three or four hundred thousand copies of these pamphlets were published, and only a million and some odd thousand were called for by members, leaving a million and over two hundred thousand bulletins to be distributed by the Secretary himself. Many of them have not been distributed at all. The appropriation in this bill provides for an increase of \$5,000 over previous appropriations, so that instead of having pamphlets to the amount provided for in previous bills this appropriation will provide for 2,500,000 of these pamphlets.

Now, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that with the facts here before us no man who is a lover of his country, no man who desires to see the affairs of this Government economically administered, can for a moment insist on taking \$20,000 additional money for this purpose.

The Secretary of this great Department is himself a practical farmer. He has as much interest in this great industry, aye, a thousand times more than the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD], who has just been criticizing this committee. The Secretary of Agriculture does not ask for this increased

appropriation. In his report he says that the committee has given for this purpose all that can be properly used by the Department. He says in his report to Congress that if \$85,000 is granted, that is all the money he wants. Now, why should this House, simply because the gentleman from Missouri or some other gentleman desires an additional number of these bulletins, make an appropriation, when the facts show that it will be impossible to send them all out? If the gentleman exhausts the amount allotted to him, let him go to the Secretary of Agriculture, who has a million and a half extra pamphlets there, and he can get all he wants.

Mr. LATIMER. Does not the gentleman know that that million and a half copies that lapsed last year have been put into the quota allotted to members this year?

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, why should they not?

Mr. LATIMER. And if you go to-day you can not get an allotment of bulletins.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, I disagree entirely with the gentleman.

Mr. LATIMER. I have been there and asked for them.

Mr. HOPKINS. Any gentleman that desires bulletins, or any series of bulletins, can get all he requires, and it is perfectly evident, in my judgment, that for anybody to get a proper number of bulletins it is not necessary to adopt this amendment, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Debate is exhausted on this amendment.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have five minutes. I moved the amendment, and I have not occupied much time yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that he may have five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, no man in this House has greater respect for the Secretary of Agriculture than I have. I think every member of this House will agree with me that no man has filled that position since the Department has been organized who has given such universal satisfaction. I went to the Secretary to find out if I could get an additional allotment of bulletins. He said to me that all the bulletins that have been appropriated for have been allotted to Members of Congress and Senators; and if bulletins lapsed last year, it is for the reason that they did not lapse until the 30th of June.

Members had probably gone to their homes. Bulletins were allotted, and those that lapsed are now in the allotment for this year, and divided pro rata among the members of the House and the Senate. I say to members of this House that the Secretary of Agriculture does not object to our having an increase of \$20,000 for the publication of these bulletins. It matters not whether he has recommended it to Congress or whether he has advised the committee to make the appropriation or not; that is not the question involved. He did ask you to give \$3,000 for the purpose of assisting the Agrostologist in his work, and you refused and only gave him \$5,000.

You have not followed the Secretary and his recommendations excepting when they met your will. The publication of these bulletins is a matter of interest to every member of this House. We are spending \$780,000 for maintaining experiment stations throughout the country. I want to ask gentlemen of this committee and members of this House, why continue these experiment stations at a cost of \$780,000 annually if we refuse to send out the information acquired through these institutions?

It is valuable information which every farmer ought to have; and I want to say to the gentleman from Illinois that out of the 200 bulletins which have been printed there are at least 100 that every farmer in your district would like to read, because they deal with subjects of vital interest to him. There is no greater interest in this country than that of agriculture. The gentleman from Missouri stated that about two-thirds of the exports from this country were furnished by the farms; yet the gentleman refused to agree to increase this appropriation so that the valuable information gathered by our experiment stations might be sent out to the farmers of the country, and thereby aid in increasing this export trade and thus adding to our national wealth.

Now, a word with regard to the position taken by the Secretary of Agriculture. He said if we wanted to increase the appropriation for seeds the members of this House have a right to so provide in the bill: that they send out these seeds to the country; that the Secretary of Agriculture gets one-third of the seeds and one-third of the agricultural bulletins, and that is all he cares to send out. But what becomes of the members of the House? What are 5,000 bulletins to Representatives having a constituency of perhaps 20,000 farmers?

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman allow me a question? I think it quite important that these bulletins should be sent out to agricultural districts; but does not the gentleman think that if

any member desires to send out to his constituents more than his quota he has friends on both sides of the House who do not need these bulletins for distribution, and who would be very glad to draw them and hand them over to those who do need them?

Mr. LATIMER. I am glad the gentleman has made that point. There are members who represent city districts and who are willing to give their bulletins to those who represent rural districts. But does not the gentleman know that, while only 5,000 bulletins are issued to each member of the House, there are members who have twenty or thirty thousand men in their district who would be glad to receive them; and that the number issued is not one-third enough to go round among the farmers of the country? This valuable information, which is being printed in these bulletins, is not fully distributed to the people, because there are thousands of farmers in our districts who would like to have fifteen or twenty of these bulletins, as they are written on different subjects.

I hope that this amendment appropriating \$20,000 for this purpose will be adopted. The result will be that each member will get 10,000 bulletins instead of 5,000. I hope, also, that the Secretary of Agriculture will be allowed to furnish to members who have not enough bulletins to distribute in their agricultural or rural districts the surplus undisposed of on the 31st of March, instead of the 1st of May, as provided in this bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] states that the people in our districts have not asked for these bulletins.

In reply to that I ask the gentleman if he sits here and waits for his constituents to call upon him for every valuable publication intended for their use? And I ask him if that is his idea of a true representative of the people? The people have commissioned us to come here in order that we may look out for their interest in all lines, and if it is true that a million of these bulletins lapsed to the Secretary last year and were not sent out by members to whom they were allotted, it is proof to my mind that they have neglected their duty to their constituents. Many of your constituents are not informed in regard to the number of bulletins you are entitled to—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the gentleman who offered this amendment, and who claims that there are not enough bulletins to go around among the people who desire them, I wish to call the attention of members of this committee to this fact: It is shown by the statistics in the report of the Secretary of Agriculture that under the appropriations we have heretofore made not one-half of the bulletins heretofore published have ever been sent out.

Mr. LATIMER. It is the fault of yourself and other gentlemen if they have not been.

Mr. HOPKINS. Before we make a greater appropriation for this purpose than has ever been made, let us wait until members take these bulletins in the quantity heretofore issued and allotted to them and send them out.

As the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture has said, under the bill now being considered by this committee, \$5,000 addition is granted over any appropriation heretofore made for these bulletins; in other words, more than 200,000 more bulletins will be published under this bill than have ever heretofore been published. If any member of Congress who exhausts his own quota will apply to the Secretary of Agriculture within the time limited by law, he can get all the bulletins that he desires. It is simply an absurdity to say that an increased appropriation of \$20,000 should be granted to procure these bulletins, when the records show that a large number of those already issued are not used or distributed.

Mr. TALBERT. I move to amend by striking out the last two words. I hope that the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. LATIMER] will prevail, because it will be but simple justice to the farmers of our country, who will be benefited by it; and in benefiting the farmers we help all other classes.

Gentlemen take very extraordinary positions in regard to the little pittance asked here. The gentleman who has just taken his seat says that the bulletins now issued are never all of them sent out, because they are never called for by their constituents.

I do not know what the case may be in other districts, but in the district that I have the honor to represent there is a strong demand, an increasing one, for every document issued by the Government, and an increasing interest is being taken in everything that pertains not only to agriculture but in every other department of the Government; and, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that in the district I have the honor to represent I have sent out year after year every bulletin that has been given to me by the Secretary of Agriculture, and after I have sent those out I have had demands upon top of demands for bulletins of various kinds and have been unable to furnish as many of them to my constituents as I would like to have done. I have gone to the Department to see what there was there for my constituents, and in justice to the Commissioner I will say that I have been kindly treated. I am astonished to hear gentlemen on this floor get up and say they

have no demand for these bulletins. Maybe it is because their constituents do not know that they are there for them. Then, why not inform them of these things?

Gentlemen, what were you sent here for if not to find out the things that your people want and send them to them? It is your duty to look into every Department and see what is there for your people and then send it out to them without waiting to be called upon by them.

I represent an agricultural district—a district of farmers as pure and patriotic as ever lived—who would be glad to get information upon all of these subjects. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS], who is generally right, has intimated, or at least his language might be construed to mean, that in the South we raise nothing but cotton, and consequently we want nothing for our constituents except treatises upon how to raise cotton. Now, I know the gentleman did not mean any such thing as that.

I will say to the gentleman that in my district, at least, and I think that is the case generally throughout the country from which I come and from whence he came, that we raise many other things besides cotton. We have been driven to this, because to raise cotton exclusively would starve us. We raise cattle and hogs, horses and mules, sheep and goats, and fowls of all kinds; we pay attention to beet culture, we pay attention to bee culture, we have dairy farms and dairy interests, and we want to get the latest information on all these subjects from the Agricultural Department in all of these various branches relating to the farmer's life—and these bulletins are a godsend to them in this way, and we want more of them published to be scattered broadcast over the land to give aid to the farmer in his calling.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit me. I know the gentleman from South Carolina is, in my opinion, the last man to do injustice to anybody, and especially to myself.

Mr. TALBERT. Certainly I would not do an injustice if I knew it, for I have very great respect for my friend.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And therefore I can not understand exactly how the gentleman should entertain the opinion that I have given utterance to the expression that we raise nothing in our country but cotton. I said nothing to that effect.

Mr. TALBERT. I only said that the position assumed by the gentleman might be so construed, and I want to say that the gentleman did not mean that, and I was showing that that was an improper construction of his language. I know the farmers have no better friend than he is upon this floor, and whatever position the gentleman may take I believe him to be honest in it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the farmers do not ask very much of this country. They have not been in the habit of doing so in the past. They trust to themselves and their Representatives, and while others, associations of capitalists and the trusts, have their lobbyists here at the doors of Congress, the farmers remain at home and attend to their work and only ask of their Representatives here to comply with the promises made to them upon the stump preceding the election.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TALBERT. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is entirely too far off from Christmas for Santa Claus to appear on the scene. I can not yield to my friend from Ohio except in Christmas times. [Laughter.]

I want to say that the questionable methods employed by the trusts and the combines, the whittling process of speculation, the sharp and questionable practices of trade and exchange, the grinding methods that are employed in many avenues of trade and commerce, and the chameleon deals of the law tampering with right and justice with the facile ease of the acrobat find no place in the life or vocabulary of the farmer. He is plain and unsophisticated. He is the only one who has no protection, or at least but little protection, at the hands of the Government. He spends his life in the hot sunshine, with all of the conditions of climate, with rain and drought to oppose him, and it does seem to me while you appropriate millions of dollars every year for others that something at least should be done for him in the line of the suggestion of my colleague from South Carolina.

Why, Mr. Chairman, you even give the Indians three times as much as you give to the farmers. You give to the Indians in this very Congress by your appropriation bill some nine millions of dollars, and you give to the farmers less than \$4,000,000 in this bill. They are the people who make it possible for the rest of you to enjoy life. By their labor they feed and clothe the world and make it possible to clothe and feed themselves, although it is sometimes a very hard task, and many of them are almost compelled to go naked and without shoes in order to keep the little farm going. Now, they ask this little trifling pittance at your hands. It is true that the committee has been more liberal than usual. They have doubled, for instance, the seed which are to be distributed, and this is most satisfactory to the farmers, as some of them only know the Government as they get a few seeds.

My distinguished friend over here, in the course of his discussion, said or intimated that the farmer had no time to read.

There was a time, Mr. Chairman, I admit, when the farmer sat around with mouth open like a mocking bird, waiting for any pebble that might be thrown into it. [Laughter.] They listened then to the language and the promises of the demagogues. But they are reading for themselves now. They have found out some things, and they are learning a good many others, and we want to recognize them in some little way other than by the assessor and tax collector. That is all I desired to say at present in advocacy of the amendment. [Applause.]

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say simply a word upon the pending proposition. I have listened to the remarks of gentlemen, and the expressions of sympathy they have given utterance to here as to the farmers of the country. But in view of the fact shown, that the bulletins for which this appropriation is to be made are not exhausted, the reasoning which gentlemen bring in support of their proposition is fallacious.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. They can get them as long as the supply is not exhausted.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. But my point is this: In every State—

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. In a moment.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. But just in that connection. Do you not know, sir, that members of Congress who have applied to the Department for bulletins have been told that they can not be supplied, that they are not printed, and that there is no appropriation available for printing them?

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. I do not believe that a request for a bulletin, coming from a member of Congress, has been denied.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. I have been unable to get them.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas (continuing). I do not believe that the bulletins can not be procured if proper efforts are made.

But the point I was going to make, Mr. Chairman, is that some \$15,000 is appropriated to each and every State for experimental agricultural stations, and these stations are sending out their reports all over the country. They are compiled in the report of the Department of Agriculture, but are first sent out by the agricultural experimental stations, and the \$15,000 appropriated to each State is used in this way.

So I say that the experience of the committee and the experience of the Department of Agriculture is against this increase. Gentleman say it is a pittance. Yes; but a great many little pittances make up a large sum. It has been the purpose of the Committee on Agriculture to keep this appropriation within reasonable bounds. They have labored industriously and honestly to bring in a liberal and just bill that would meet the demands of the people of this country, and we believe we have done it.

If we were to listen to all the officials who come before our committee, and were to act upon all that they said with reference to the extreme utility of their Departments to the country, we could appropriate \$25,000,000 here in the agricultural appropriation bill. Gentlemen, I am opposed to the amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. TALBERT] stated the farmers are sitting at home "dumb as oysters." That accounts for some of the representation on this floor. [Laughter.] The gentleman may speak for the farmers of his district, but not for the farmers of my district. If the gentleman would only have allowed me, when he said that the farmers of his district were suddenly coming to their senses and were about to expurgate the demagogues, I was about to bid the gentleman a fond and affectionate farewell [laughter], but he would not allow me to do it.

Mr. TALBERT. The gentleman had better look out for himself. The gentleman from South Carolina is all right, and he is looking out for his people.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, the gentleman may be all right as long as the farmers sit at home as "dumb as oysters."

Mr. TALBERT. I should like to ask the gentleman why it is that the Republicans of Ohio will not let you be governor? You have been trying to be long enough.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman is inclined to be personal. I never was a candidate for governor and never considered the subject in my life.

Mr. TALBERT. They would not let you be.

Mr. GROSVENOR. How do you know?

Mr. TALBERT. They would not even let you be a candidate, much less elect you.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, well, the gentleman's constituents doubtless are as "dumb as oysters."

Mr. TALBERT. I mean that they have no lobbyist here as other professions have.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Now, Mr. Chairman, the farmers' bulletins are very valuable, and if the gentleman himself wants any I can give him several thousand that I find myself unable to dispose of. I have sent them wherever called for, and I have an agricultural district. The people there are not as "dumb as oysters," and I will say to the gentleman from South Carolina that a very

large majority of them can read and write. I will give the gentleman several thousand copies of these bulletins rather than have them pile up in an accumulation here that nobody wants.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to ask the gentleman what right he has to give those bulletins away?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, well, I do not know that I have any; but they are published for the benefit of the people who want them.

Mr. LATIMER. For the farmers of your district.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would give my friend from Missouri a hundred agricultural reports if I thought that they would do more good in his district than they would in mine.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I will take them. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. There is no need of any reports in a district which my friend CLARK of Missouri represents. It does not need anything but his own intelligence to enlighten that district. I am opposed to this amendment, because I do not believe that the farmers of the country want this additional appropriation.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to say to the gentleman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. I move that all debate on this paragraph be now closed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks that debate on this paragraph be closed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I ask for a vote on the first amendment, which is the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, increasing the appropriation \$20,000.

Mr. DALZELL. Let us have the amendment reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. BARTLETT. I desire to have that amendment divided up. There are some parts of it that some of us may desire to vote for.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I propose to ask for a separate vote on each amendment. I have no objection to the other amendments. They are not material.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 6, strike out the word "eighty" and insert the words "one hundred and," so that instead of reading "\$85,000" it will read "\$105,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LATIMER. Division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 76, noes 61.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Tellers, Mr. Chairman.

The question was taken on ordering tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a sufficient number. Tellers are ordered; and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LATIMER] will act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 25, line 7, strike out "thirty" and insert "fifty."

Mr. WADSWORTH. One moment. What is that amendment?

Mr. LATIMER. Making the language conform.

Mr. BARTLETT. I ask to have that reported again.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is all right, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment again.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

In line 7, strike out the words "two-thirds" and insert the words "four-fifths."

Mr. WADSWORTH. I have no objection to that amendment, Mr. Chairman.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

On page 26, line 1, strike out the word "June" and insert the word "March."

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. LATIMER. Division.

Mr. BARTLETT. I make the point of order that the division was called for too late. The Chair had announced the result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had not announced the result before the division was called for.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 42.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Line 15, page 26, strike out "eighty" and insert "one hundred and," so as to read "\$150,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next section.

The Clerk read as follows:

PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF VALUABLE SEEDS.

For the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere; transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, \$170,000, of which amount not more than \$22,000 shall be expended for labor in the city of Washington, D. C.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment; and pending the consideration of the amendment, I desire to reserve the point of order on that paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report, and pending the consideration of the amendment, the gentleman reserves the point of order on the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting after the word "seed," in line 18, page 26, the words "dinner pails for the laboring people."

[Laughter.]

Mr. LOUD. How can the gentleman offer an amendment and also reserve the point of order against it?

Mr. CORLISS. I do not reserve the point of order against the amendment, but against the paragraph.

Mr. Chairman, I find upon investigation that the law authorizing this appropriation to be made for the distribution of seed expressly provides that the purchase of seeds shall be confined to seeds rare and uncommon to the country. Instead of complying with that provision, the Secretary of Agriculture has from time to time purchased all kinds of common seeds, such as cabbage seeds, turnip, and other common seeds, for distribution, until the appropriation has become very much abused in the distribution and in the purchase of seeds. Why, you discover with proper care not to exceed 10 per cent of all the seeds purchased and distributed are sufficiently valuable to grow; and I think that the result and the practice under this paragraph is simply to benefit the seed trust that every year seeks to dispose of its accumulated worthless seed and have them distributed gratuitously by members of Congress to their constituents.

It is a waste of public money. Mr. Chairman, it is an infringement of the rights of our citizens. In every city, in every little hamlet of our country, you will find grocery men who derive some revenue from the sale of seed, and it is an infringement of their rights. I have offered this amendment, and will offer another one in a few moments upon this paragraph, in good faith. There are in this country two citizens that obtain their living by the sweat of their brow to one who acquires his living by tilling the soil. You are appropriating for a special class; you are giving them a special benefit. My amendment asks that dinner pails shall be furnished to the laboring men. I represent a city that has probably 25,000 laboring men in it and not to exceed 1,000 farmers who cultivate the soil within my district, outside of a little garden. Why should you appropriate for the benefit of your constituents \$175,000 for cabbage seeds and not give the laboring men in my district a dinner pail?

Mr. McRAE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he does not also represent D. M. Ferry & Co.?

Mr. CORLISS. I represent all the people that live within my district, but I do not want the Secretary of Agriculture to go into D. M. Ferry's establishment and buy worthless seeds that they want to sell and give them to the farmers, when not a dozen of them will come up.

Mr. McRAE. Do you mean to say that this Administration does that?

Mr. CORLISS. I mean to say that 10 per cent of all the seeds distributed by the Agricultural Department are common seeds and valueless seeds that do not grow, and you can not prove to the contrary.

Mr. McRAE. I can prove to the contrary.

Mr. CORLISS. Now, what is the law under which you are misappropriating this money? The law says that you shall confine your appropriations to such seeds as are rare and uncommon. Is it cabbages, turnips, and cucumbers, and some corn that you may buy in Indiana? Are they uncommon and rare?

Mr. STEELE. If you buy Indiana corn, it is rare in quality.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CORLISS. It rarely grows anywhere outside of Indiana.

Mr. STEELE. It will grow anywhere, but we will not agree to buy rare dinner buckets for people who do not want them.

Mr. CORLISS. If it grows anywhere outside of Indiana, it runs to stalk and does not make corn.

Mr. SHATTUC. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CORLISS. Yes.

Mr. SHATTUC. Will you amend that by making it one of Mr. Atkinson's dinner pails? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman from Michigan may continue for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks that the gentleman from Michigan may continue for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question. He made the statement that 10 per cent only of these garden seeds grow. I am informed that they are all tested by the Department of Agriculture, and that the best seeds in the world are bought and distributed, and that is my experience. I believe he has made an unwarranted attack on the Department, and I think also an unwarranted attack on his constituent, D. M. Ferry & Co.

Mr. CORLISS. I am making no attack on the Department.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman read from the Revised Statutes the law relating to the distribution of seeds. Now, I sympathize with the gentleman in his position, but I call his attention to the fact that two years ago we amended that law, I am sorry to say, so as to permit the distribution of seeds which are not rare and valuable.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to have the gentleman point it out.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The amendment was on a general appropriation bill, and offered, I think, by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

Mr. CORLISS. Making it within the power of the Secretary—

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. To buy any kind of seeds and distribute them anywhere.

Mr. CORLISS. I regret that Congress will go on in that way. You are authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to do business, to go into the jobbing business of seeds.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. STEELE. That is where the pinch comes.

Mr. CORLISS (continuing). I submit that it is wrong. I do not care whether I represent a municipal district or an agricultural district; it is wrong. When you attempt to appropriate money from the Treasury that belongs to the people, give it to one class and deny another the same privilege, you are violating your oaths as members of this House.

If you authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to distribute rare and uncommon seeds for the benefit of the farmer, I will vote with you; but I submit that if you are going to buy common seeds that are known throughout the world to everybody, that can be bought from every corner grocery, then I submit that you should stop. I have offered this amendment because Congress is pursuing a course that is wrong; and if you are bound to give to the farmer one advantage, I ask for the laborer an opportunity to take his dinner pail with him to his place of work every day. I shall offer, Mr. Chairman, an amendment to this paragraph limiting it back to the original law, providing that none but rare and uncommon seeds shall be purchased, if you vote this present amendment down.

Mr. HOPKINS. I want to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture has not in every instance exercised his discretion and sought to get rare varieties of seed, and has done the best he could to distribute them over the country for the benefit of all the people?

Mr. CORLISS. I believe that the Secretary of Agriculture has exercised great care in buying the best seeds he can buy, and has carried out the law as it has been enacted by Congress; but I want to say to you that it is impossible for the Secretary of Agriculture to buy in this country the quantity of seeds that you compel him to buy unless he buys them of the seed trust, and they have—

Mr. HOPKINS. One moment—

Mr. CORLISS (continuing). In their hands a large quantity of seed they desire to impose upon the farmer through the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOPKINS. If the gentleman will allow me, the Secretary has provided against that.

Mr. CORLISS. How?

Mr. HOPKINS. There was some complaint during the last Democratic Administration that the Secretary of Agriculture had been imposed upon in this respect, and the present Secretary has carried out the spirit of the law—

Mr. CORLISS. I have not any doubt about that, and I have

as much appreciation and admiration for the present Secretary of Agriculture as you can have; but I want to say to you—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. HILL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Connecticut rise to oppose the amendment?

Mr. HILL. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment; but I am more interested in a place to put seed than I am in dinner pails. I would like to ask a question of the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands. I understand there is a large immigration from Finland to the southeastern part of Alaska and the Aleutian Islands. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands if it is possible for foreigners to locate under existing land laws in Alaska or take up land and improve it?

Mr. LATIMER. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LATIMER. The agreement was when we went in under the five-minute rule that we should be confined to the bill before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that in my five minutes the question I have put may be answered by the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. LATIMER. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, a word in reply to what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] has had to say about the distribution of seeds. We expected from him, a city member, such insults as he has offered to the laboring men and the farmers by this amendment, but we did not expect that he would so far forget himself as to make unjust reflections upon the present worthy Secretary of Agriculture as to the character of the seed sent out. I presume also that the Parke-Davis Drug Company of Detroit is fighting the Secretary because of his free distribution of vaccine for blackleg in cattle. We can expect on the seed question the opposition of the gentleman, who has within his district, as disclosed by this debate, the great seed house of D. M. Ferry & Co., and the gentleman appears to be representing them as against the great body of the farmers of the United States.

The distribution of seeds does the people more good than any other equal amount of money spent by the Government. The seeds that are sent out are the most valuable that can be had, and the people want them because they are better than they can buy. Since the seed distribution began there has been a great improvement in all sections of the country in gardening and more of it. We find on the large country farms as well as the little homesteads in and around the cities more vegetables with which to support life and make people independent than we did before this practice began. It is a benefit to the people and they want the seeds.

So far as my vote is concerned, it shall be given to retain the law as it is—to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to buy such valuable seeds as are adapted to our soil, and permit them to be distributed among the people who desire to experiment with them.

Since the gentleman claims to be so economical, I will ask him to answer, in my time, whether he is in favor of the Payne-Hanna ship-subsidy bill and the Pacific cable bill, which will require millions. He refuses to pay any attention to my question. I therefore assume he is in favor of both of them.

So far as I am concerned, I hope the laboring men of his district and the farmers, if he has any such constituents, will rebuke the insult that he has offered to them by his ridiculous amendment. This "dinner-pail" business should not aid him with any laboring man, for they do not object to the seeds being sent to the farmers. It is an insult to that class of honest voters to make such an appeal to them. I see the gentleman rise, and I again ask him to tell the House whether he is in favor of the Pacific cable bill and in favor of the Payne-Hanna ship-subsidy bill. I can not get him to answer, and yet he objects to this small appropriation for seed.

Mr. HILL. I make the point of order that the gentleman is out of order, under the ruling just made.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I wish to call the attention of members of the committee to the different kinds of seeds appropriated for in this bill. Seeds distributed by Congressmen come under the provision beginning on line 17, page 26, of this bill. It is in these words:

For the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants.

Now, if you will turn to the top of page 29 you will find this proviso:

Provided further, That \$20,000 of the sum thus appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries for experiments with reference to their introduction into this country.

The seeds distributed by us are simply valuable seeds, not rare seeds. The seeds distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture under the \$20,000 appropriation are rare seeds, mostly obtained abroad for experimental purposes in this country.

Mr. TALBERT. Mr. Chairman, this is a very singular amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. I would like to ask him what kind of a plant the "dinner pail" is. I know that in my district and my part of the country we have various kinds of seeds, but I have never yet seen any of that kind. Down in my district we have good, pure, healthy seed furnished by the Agricultural Department, which, in fertile soil and under a generous sun, have brought forth manifold fine products with which to support both man and beast. I want to ask the gentleman what kind of a pail he proposes to introduce among the laboring people of this country, or did he say piggin?

Does he propose to ridicule the farmers of our country or does he propose to insult them? It seems to me an insult to the laboring people of this land that he should get up here and offer to give them a piggin with nothing in the world in it—just as the Republicans always treat the great mass of the people of this country, feeding them only on promises. The gentleman has uncovered the policy of that party with regard to the farmers and the laboring people, whom they are always trying to deceive by the merest bosh and demagoguery, pretending to be their friends; and now you come forward with an empty piggin, with nothing in the world in it, instead of giving them something in reality. The gentleman himself looks as if he had been standing for some time by the side of an empty piggin [laughter], and he desires to place that kind of a piggin before the laboring people of the country in order to reduce them to a helpless and forlorn condition.

The gentleman has spoken of class legislation. Let me say that no legislation in the interest of the great mass of the farmers can be characterized as class legislation; because when you pass a law that benefits the agricultural people, you thereby benefit every other man, woman, and child belonging to every other class or profession; because agriculture is the foundation stone of all prosperity and all happiness. It is the farmers who raise up the men and the "boys" to fight the battles of our country and to run the machinery of our great factories. It is the farmers who pay 80 per cent of these appropriations which are passed by these billion-dollar Congresses—these Republican Congresses—of late, and now you want to cap the climax by giving them an empty piggin. Stop the farm and the fire goes out in the furnace. Stop the plow and your streets in the great cities will grow up in grass.

Why, Mr. Chairman, just think for a moment. Think of the old farmer at the end of the year, when he is becoming old, when he is growing tired, weary with hard work, hardly able to make both ends meet. But he goes around to every other class of people in the community to pay his honest obligations in the fall of the year. He goes to the lawyer's office—and many of the lawyers are here present—to pay his fee. And, with his hands in his vest, he says, "Well, it has been a hard time; you are the bone and sinew of the land; and I will not charge you so much as I otherwise would. I hope you will have better crops next year." And all the time he is cramming the money into his pocket which has been raised by the sweat and the toil of the old man. He goes to the teacher, to the professor, who has already put his bill up to a pretty high notch and he can afford to scale it down, and says, "I have come to pay my bill." He says to the farmer, "You have had a hard time this year; you are the bone and sinew; crops have been bad, and I won't charge you as much as I otherwise would." And all the time he is cramming the money into his pocket. He goes to the merchant and pays up his bill, and the merchant tells him he must keep out of politics.

He goes to the doctor and finds the same treatment there; and finally he goes to the preacher, the good old preacher, who takes him into his study and says, "I know you are behind this year, for you have been sick and have had poor crops." The old farmer says, "I came to pay the pastor's salary," and the pastor, while he is cramming the money into his pocket, says, "I know that you are the bone and sinew of the country; you have had a hard time this year, but if you do not get your blessings now you will in the 'sweet bye and bye.'" [Laughter and applause.] So it goes; he pays the money that keeps things going for all other classes.

And the gentleman from Michigan, on the top of all of this, comes up here with his little piggin, can, or something of that kind, to force it upon the working people of this country with nothing in it; because it appears that he has been standing for some time inside of one of them, with nothing in it whatever. [Laughter and applause.]

Let us do away with any such stuff in the shape of an amendment and give a liberal appropriation to those who are the very foundation of this great Government in time of peace or war.

Recognize the great mass of the farmers, who furnish 70 per cent of our export product to settle our balances with foreign nations. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I desire to amend by inserting in the fourth line, before the word "dinner," the words— [Cries of "Louder!" "Louder!"] Amend in the fourth line, before the word "dinner"— [Renewed cries of "Louder!" and laughter.] I ask the Clerk to read. [Laughter and applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

In the fourth line, before the word "dinner," add the words "Atkinson's workingman's;" so that it will read, when amended, "Atkinson's workingman's dinner pail for the laboring people."

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TALBERT. I move to lay the amendment and the gentleman from Michigan both on the table. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment. The amendment was again read.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, has not debate been exhausted upon the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that it has been.

Mr. TALBERT. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan be allowed to put something in the pail. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be recognized by unanimous consent.

Mr. WADSWORTH. For five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. For five minutes.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was offered by myself in perfect good faith. I am satisfied the members of this House are determined to have the privilege of sending to their constituents seeds that are purchased and have been purchased for a great many years for the purpose of pleasing certain members and certain numbers of people in each district throughout the country. It is wrong in principle and it ought not to be tolerated any longer. Now, if the Agricultural Department—

Mr. HEPBURN. Will the gentleman yield for an instant?

Mr. CORLISS. Unless I can have my time extended—

Mr. HEPBURN. I would like to ask the gentleman simply what he does with his own quota of seed?

Mr. CORLISS. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman. I have given nearly all of them to my people in my district. Many do not desire them; others do. I send them where they are desired. I have traded them off in some instances for good maps and valuable documents, which my people are interested in and do want, and in that way I utilize the privilege which has been extended under the law. It is wrong and I desire to go upon record as opposed to it; but as you are disposed to give to a few of the farmers to whom you want to extend a little courtesy some seeds that perhaps are mere shells with nothing in them, I insist that the laboring men of my district shall be permitted to have dinner pails, because under the Administration of the Republican party during the last three years, thank God, the laboring people of my district have something to put in their dinner pails, which they did not have under the Democratic Administration.

Mr. GAINES. What did the Administration put in our Spanish war soldiers' pails? Rotten beef.

Mr. CORLISS. I want to say to you that the Agricultural Department would buy a pail that would be large enough to fill with the dinner that a good, honest laboring man of this country would desire, and that he could fill with the wages he now receives.

Mr. ATWATER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CORLISS. Yes.

Mr. ATWATER. Has the gentleman ever received any notice from any one of his constituents that they did not want the seeds that were sent to them?

Mr. CORLISS. I have been told by a great many people in my city that they did not want the seed and that they could not use them; and not only that, but there are 500 little corner groceries in my district that sell seed to the agricultural districts outside, who are thereby deprived of a little revenue that they would get by the sale of the seeds.

Mr. ATWATER. I should like to ask the gentleman if he has ever been notified by any farmers that they did not want the seeds that were sent them?

Mr. CORLISS. I have been notified by farmers that they tried these seeds that I sent them two years ago and a year ago, and that they did not grow, and they thought they were worthless; that they were seeds that had been taken from old stock and had been sold to the Department by men who desired to impose upon the public.

Mr. ATWATER. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. CORLISS. Farmers and gardeners have told me, and men

who have planted the seeds in their gardens have told me, that the seeds would not grow, and, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, not to exceed 10 per cent of these seeds will grow.

Mr. ATWATER. Does the gentleman undertake to say to this House that the Secretary of Agriculture is buying seeds that are worthless?

Mr. CORLISS. I lay the blame right here in this House and in the Senate, where it belongs. I say that when you pass laws appropriating money contrary to the spirit of the original act creating that Department, you are violating your oaths of office. If the law has been amended, it is unjust and ought to be corrected, and I will offer an amendment further on to correct it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS].

The question being taken; on a division (demanded by Mr. CORLISS) there were—ayes 2, noes 65.

Accordingly, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment here.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all after line 16 on page 26, all of page 27, and all on page 28. That strikes out all the appropriation for the common garden seeds and leaves in that part which appropriates \$20,000 for rare and valuable seeds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on that amendment I wish to make a few remarks. I represent, perhaps, the largest agricultural constituency of any man on this floor; and while I have no authority to speak for them, still I am willing to go back and meet them upon this question. The principle that appropriates money to send out garden seeds is wrong. I can just as conscientiously come before you and ask you to send out improved breeds of cattle, hogs, and horses to the people of the United States as to send out these garden seeds. I offer this amendment on principle, because we are following a custom here that is wrong. I want to say to members that if you think you are pandering to the farmers, on the theory that you can buy a farmer for 13 cents' worth of seed, you are putting a low estimate upon the farmers of this country.

Mr. BALL. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. BALL. Has the gentleman anything against the farmers of Kansas?

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Have I got anything against them? No, sir; nothing. I am a farmer myself; a de facto farmer and not an agriculturist. I simply say that the principle is wrong; but I believe this House is going to pass this provision. You see the iniquity of the proceeding and the tendency that it has when it has already doubled the money expended. Why have you any right to send out garden seed?

We want seed corn and seed wheat, and yet you want to go on; and you are pandering to the farmer, to obtain his good will, thinking you can do so by sending him a small package of garden seed that can be bought in any city or town in this country for 13 cents a package. I say such a proposition is ridiculous. I will send them out if the appropriation is made, but I do not believe in the principle, which is simply to give a fellow 13 cents' worth of garden seeds. I do not believe that anybody can be elected to Congress by a package of garden seed.

Mr. STEELE. What are the rare seeds worth?

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Oh, the original proposition of this was all right. The principle of the Government was to buy rare seeds and let those to whom they were sent make experiments. The gentleman from Indiana who has just interrupted me spoke in regard to Alaska yesterday. He says that in Alaska they never have had any agriculture. That is the thing that the experimental station was instituted for; to make experiments in new country, where it has never been done, and it is the province of the Agricultural Department to make experiments in new and rare seeds and to get new markets; but beets and turnips and cabbages are not rare seed, and it is ridiculous to say that they should be distributed. I hope, gentlemen, the amendment I offered will be adopted. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CORLISS. My dinner pail is bearing fruit. I have got another man to stand with me, and I earnestly hope that this motion will prevail. It has been discussed, I know, in Congress a long time. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas can apply to only that portion of the bill which has already been read, but it will be accepted as a notice of a proposed amendment to that portion which has not been read. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the section just read. On page 27, after the word "Columbia," insert "and not less than \$90,000 shall be allowed for Congress-

sional distribution." I want to say to the House that this amendment has been agreed to by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the House is content to have the appropriation, I am willing that the amendment should be made.

Mr. LATIMER. The object is simply to give Members of Congress and Senators a larger share in this appropriation, that they may pay for the seed, and then they will be given to them to distribute instead of doing so in the other words used in the bill. We have already appropriated \$175,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 27, line 2, after the word "Columbia," insert "and not less than \$90,000 shall be allowed for Congressional distribution."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as hereinafter stated, and such seed so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds, suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States. An equal proportion of two-thirds of all seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the Department upon the receipt of their addressed frank; and the person receiving such seeds shall be requested to inform the Department of the results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, bulbs, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for on the 1st of May shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before, during the same season, been supplied by the Department; *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter: *Provided further*, That \$20,000 of the sum thus appropriated, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, from foreign countries for experiments with reference to their introduction into this country; and the seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants thus collected, purchased, tested, and propagated shall not be included in general distribution, but shall be used for experimental tests, to be carried on with the cooperation of the agricultural experimental stations.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment. Line 25, page 27, strike out the word "May" and insert "March."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 25, page 27, strike out the word "May" and insert the word "March."

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly willing to have the House decide that question for itself. It is a matter for its own convenience, and is not important.

Mr. LATIMER. I want to state the object of the amendment. Under this bill all seed not called for by May 1 revert back to the Secretary of Agriculture. This is too late to send seed to the South, so that if the 1st of March is substituted for May all seed not called for by members will be left with the Secretary two months earlier, and can be given to members by the Secretary in time to distribute. Those who desire their full quota have only to notify the Secretary of this fact, and they will be kept for them; but if you fail to notify him and they revert to the Secretary, they ought to be by the 1st of March, so that he can allot them to members who desire to send them out. That is the object of this amendment.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman if he has any information as to the percentage of allotments that do not go out among the people, that are not distributed by members?

Mr. LATIMER. I think most of the seed are given out, although late. But it will be a great advantage to members to have it early enough to send them out. The Assistant Secretary told me that no more seed could be allotted until after May 1. If then the members failed to claim their quota, we might get some more; but if they do not come in until the 1st of May, it is too late for the South.

Mr. LLOYD. I want to ask if there is not a suggestion made anywhere here with reference to what he shall do with the allotments that lapse?

Mr. LATIMER. Under the law the Secretary gives them to the members of Congress.

Mr. LLOYD. But he does not distribute them again?

Mr. LATIMER. He has the authority to distribute them himself.

Mr. LLOYD. But he only distributes them to persons who ask for them?

Mr. LATIMER. Yes.

Mr. LLOYD. It does not add anything to the allotment of members?

Mr. LATIMER. Only as the Secretary may give them out on request will it add to their allotment.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to say to the gentleman from South Carolina that if he will turn to the bill—

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Carolina what his proposition is?

Mr. LATIMER. It is to change the time that seeds shall lapse from May 1 until March 1.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. I think that is a very unfair proposition to submit to the House.

Mr. LATIMER. I do not believe the gentleman would make that statement if he understood the proposition.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. It may be of some convenience to the gentleman from South Carolina, but it would be a very great inconvenience to gentlemen from the North.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Well, I will show that it is no great inconvenience to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. I want to say to the gentleman that the great bulk of our seeds are sent out after the 1st of March.

Mr. LATIMER. That will be no inconvenience to gentlemen from the North. Members can notify the Secretary of Agriculture that they shall want their full quota and they will be retained for them.

Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania. I do not think the Representatives from the North should be required to notify the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will permit me, he will notice on page 28, at the bottom, the following provision:

That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-second parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery on the 10th day of January, or at the earliest practicable time thereafter.

Now, that gives gentlemen from the South from the 10th of January until the 1st of May. We do not need our seed in the North until about the 1st of April.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. We do not get thawed out until the 1st of May.

Mr. LATIMER. This was a suggestion made by the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, and he said it was a suggestion that he thought would meet with the approval of the House. I am perfectly willing to leave it with the House.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I talked with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Assistant Secretary, and I hope members will give me their attention, not so much for the way in which I say it as for what I say. The way it is now, the quotas of Congressmen are not subject to the action of the Secretary of Agriculture until the 1st of May; therefore, all such quotas as fall to the Secretary after the 1st of May go entirely to the North. Why? The planting season for garden seeds has gone by in the South, and the operation of the law as it now stands is entirely sectional.

I went down there and wanted to get an additional quota of seeds, because I had such a demand for them from our people, and the Secretary says: "I shall have some quotas that have been allotted by the 1st of May, but until then I do not know how many or what I shall have." Well, after that time every quota that is forfeited, let it be a Southern, a Northern, an Eastern, or a Western, and they must go entirely to the North, where it is not too late for garden purposes. The suggestion of the Secretary to make it the 1st of March would enable him to redistribute the quotas all over the country, because it is early enough to plant in gardens over the entire country.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The best way would be to give us a quota and a half apiece to start with.

Mr. SIMS. We are doubling the quota now. Consequently, if there should be any number of quotas forfeited to the Agricultural Department because not called for, there would be an additional number go to the North, because it would be too late for planting in the Southern country and the South would have no use for them. So the Secretary of Agriculture has made this suggestion himself. It does not force members to send their seeds any earlier. All that is necessary is to notify him before the 1st of March that they will want their quota, and those who do not so notify him can be used just as is that portion that is given to the Secretary of Agriculture. That is the object of the amendment; not to draw the line or take any advantage, but to keep the law as

if now is from operating so as to make it an advantage for one part of the country and a disadvantage for the other.

Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS. Why not have an amendment requiring those seeds for the South to be forfeited by the 1st of March, and when forfeited to go to the South, and leave the others just as they are?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I think one date can be made satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. KLUTTZ. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from South Carolina will consent to April 1 instead of March 1.

Mr. LATIMER. Mr. Chairman, I think it is the desire of the House to harmonize on this question, and so I agree to change it from the 1st of March to the 1st of April; and then I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina will be changed from March 1 to April 1. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 27, line 25, strike out "May" and insert "April."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania) there were—ayes 71, noes 38.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Line 10, page 27, after the word "shall," insert "only such as are rare and uncommon seeds."

Mr. WADSWORTH. That amendment would destroy the whole effect of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. I make the point of order that we can not hear anything that is being said.

Mr. McRAE. I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Nobody has heard the amendment.

Mr. McRAE. I heard part of it; and I make the point of order that it changes existing law, and it therefore is not in order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Let us hear the amendment read.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] desire to debate the point of order?

Mr. CORLISS. I will simply say that the law now provides—I refer to the statute—that these purchases of seeds shall be confined to rare and uncommon seeds; and I submit there is no law contradicting that, notwithstanding the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts; at least I have not been able to find any.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a word upon the question of order. Although my memory is that the law has been altered so as to permit the distribution of all kinds of seeds, yet there is nothing in parliamentary law which would prevent Congress from declining to appropriate for some of the seeds for which under the law it would be permitted to appropriate. That is to say, under the old law the only kind of seeds which could be provided for in an appropriation bill was rare and valuable seeds.

Now, the law has been so amended that all kinds of seeds can be appropriated for. Under the old law a point of order would lie against any appropriation for any kind of seed except rare and valuable seed; but now that the law is extended so as to cover all kinds of seeds, it is not out of order for the House of Representatives to decline to appropriate for some part of the seeds which it might appropriate for if it saw fit. There is no change of existing law; there is simply a refusal on the part of the House of Representatives—if they should adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan—to appropriate for some purposes for which they were authorized by law to appropriate. I submit respectfully to the Chair that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan is in order under the rules of this House.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, the mere statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] shows that this amendment, if adopted, would be a change of law. Congress, after due consideration, so changed the law that the Secretary of Agriculture would not be required to spend the seed money for the class of seeds of which the amendment speaks, except in his own discretion, and now to instruct him by law to use all this money or any part of it for that kind of seeds—rare and uncommon—would be to change the law and take from him the discretion to use this money as he might see fit in the purchase of valuable seed adapted to the soil in the various States. There can be no question about the fact that the amendment would change the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. One moment, Mr. Chairman, on the point of order. The point is that the amendment changes existing law. We need first to know what the existing law is and then what the amendment is. The existing law—and the provision of the bill is a repetition of the existing law—is that "the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum as nearly as practicable in the purchase and distribution of such

valuable seeds, etc., the best he can obtain at public or private sale."

Now, if the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the law will provide that he is to expend this money for valuable seeds, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, but only such as are rare and uncommon. Now, when we undertake to confine the expenditure of this money to the purchase of seeds which are rare and uncommon, there is undoubtedly a change of existing law.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to a single authority which I think is conclusive upon this question. It is a decision made on the 17th of January, 1896, by Mr. Dingley, of Maine, then acting as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. It was a decision made after two weeks of debate. A point of order had been reserved, and the decision was withheld for two weeks; therefore the greatest consideration was given to the question of order.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire only to refer to a single sentence from the decision found on page 309 of Hinds's Digest. I quote from the decision:

The House in Committee of the Whole has the right to refuse to appropriate for any object which it may deem improper, although that object may be authorized by law.

And while, by existing law, the House may make appropriations for all kinds of seeds, it is not for that reason bound to appropriate for them, but it may decline to appropriate for seeds altogether or may decline to appropriate for such seeds as in its wisdom it sees fit to exclude. So long as the seeds conform to the description prescribed by law, an added qualification limits the seeds, but does not change the law.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, there can be no question, not on the merits of the amendment, for that is an entirely different question, but on the parliamentary status of the amendment, and I submit that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. McRAE. If, Mr. Chairman, the amendment involved the question of the refusal to appropriate at all, unquestionably the point of order should not be sustained against it. But that is not the question involved. Of course the whole or any part of the appropriation could be stricken out. But the gentleman does not make that motion. He simply moves that this appropriation shall not be used in accordance with existing law and directs another way for it to be used. If that was not the purpose of it, the amendment would not be offered at all.

It is proposed here to require the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase an entirely different character of seeds from what the statute requires, destroying his discretion under the law and compelling him to buy rare and uncommon seeds. The law requires him to purchase valuable seeds adapted to the various sections of the United States.

It is manifestly a change of existing law, and I hope the Chair will so hold.

Mr. HOPKINS. Can we have the amendment read again for the information of the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the amendment will be again read.

The amendment was again reported, as follows:

In line 10, page 27, after the word "shall," insert the words "be only such as are rare and uncommon seeds."

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, in 1897 there was a change in the law with reference to the purchase of seeds. The law provided for—

The purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds.

The other words that have been quoted here in this debate it will be seen are omitted.

Again, in 1898, the language is:

For the purchase, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, etc.

It will be seen that the words "rare and uncommon seeds" are not used in that connection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That was also the law in 1899.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Chairman—

Several members addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. HOPKINS. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Moody] I think is in error in the position he takes. A slight analysis of his argument will show that his position is not well taken. This Congress may refuse to make the appropriation altogether. But if it attempts to make the appropriation, that appropriation must be made in accordance with the law; and the law has provided how this shall be done.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman, before he proceeds, permit me to call his attention to a paragraph from the ruling of Mr. Dingley, from which I have already quoted?

Mr. HOPKINS. Certainly.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Dingley, in that ruling, referred to a precedent which had been cited, which authorized the printing of greenbacks of certain denominations. And the

proviso in the following words was held to be in order on an appropriation bill:

Provided, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall not use any money appropriated by this paragraph for the printing of greenbacks of a larger denomination than those that are canceled.

In connection with that proviso Mr. Dingley uses this language:

Now look for a moment at the principle of limitation or restriction as established by that proviso. In that case the law authorized the printing of greenbacks of any denomination in the discretion of the Secretary of the Treasury. The proviso limited the use of the money which was appropriated in that single year to the printing of denominations which should not be smaller than those that were canceled. Now, observe that the limitation was simply this: The appropriation could not be used for a purpose authorized by law. That is all the limitation there was to it.

And he goes on and approves this decision, which it seems to me is precisely the question presented here.

Mr. HOPKINS. Yes; but, Mr. Chairman, that is a limitation, and this is an absolute change of the law as it has been read by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN]. It is entirely different from the law as proposed in the pending amendment. I agree with the gentleman that we can withhold an appropriation if we see fit, but if we attempt to make an appropriation we must make it in accordance with existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the point of order made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] is well taken, for the reason that existing law provides that a certain kind or class of seeds shall be purchased and distributed, while the amendment would entirely change the character of the seeds now permitted by law; therefore the point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Bureau of Animal Industry: For carrying out the provisions of an act of May 29, 1884, establishing the Bureau of Animal Industry, and the act of August 30, 1890, providing for an inspection of meats and animals, and also the provisions of the act of March 3, 1891, providing for the inspection of live cattle, hogs, and the carcasses and products thereof which are the subjects of interstate and foreign commerce, and for other purposes: *Provided*, That live horses and the products and carcasses thereof be entitled to the same inspection as other animals, carcasses, and products thereof herein named: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may in his discretion waive the requirements of a certificate with beef and other products, which are exported to countries that do not require such inspection, \$1,000,000; and the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby authorized to use any part of this sum he may deem necessary or expedient, in such manner as he may think best, in the collection of information concerning live stock, dairy, and other animal products, and to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, blackleg, tuberculosis, sheep scab, glanders or farcy, hog cholera, and other diseases of animals, and for this purpose to employ as many persons as he may deem necessary, and to expend any part of this sum in the purchase and destruction of diseased or exposed animals and the quarantine of the same whenever in his judgment it is essential to prevent the spread of pleuro-pneumonia, tuberculosis, or other diseases of animals from one State to another, for improving and maintaining the Bureau Experiment Station, at Bethesda, Md.; for printing and publishing such reports relating to animal industry as he may direct; and the Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other animal products of the United States, and for suitable transportation of the same; and such products may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such products toward the continuation and repetition of such experimental exports; and the Secretary is hereby authorized to rent a suitable building in the District of Columbia, at an annual rental not exceeding \$1,800, to be used as a laboratory for said Bureau of Animal Industry, and the employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry outside of the city of Washington may hereafter, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be granted leaves of absence not to exceed fifteen days in any one year.

Mr. MAHON. I desire to give notice that I shall raise a point of order against the next paragraph, because it is new legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I did not hear the gentleman's point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania gave notice that he intended to raise a point of order to the next section when read.

Mr. CORLISS. I desire to offer an amendment to the section just read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 24, page 30, by striking out the word "blackleg."

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. The section has been passed by the committee.

Mr. CORLISS. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it had not.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is not well taken. The gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in offering this amendment is to eliminate from the Agricultural Department the manufacture of what is known as blackleg vaccine. I have in my district the largest manufactory of drugs in the world. Two

years before the Agricultural Department commenced the development of the remedy known as blackleg vaccine the concern in my district which I have mentioned had manufactured it, demonstrated its value, and placed it upon the market, and for years they have been selling the blackleg vaccine against the free distribution thereof by the Agricultural Department.

Now, I submit that the true purpose of the Agricultural Department is to develop, experiment, and ascertain remedies for disease, that when they ascertain a result they should publish it to the world. They should give the citizens of our country the knowledge and information that they have obtained by their investigations. They should show how the application can be made, but they should not go into the business of supplying a well-known remedy like this. They might just as well undertake to usurp the right to manufacture all the remedies for the suppression of yellow fever, smallpox, and other well-known diseases which are prevalent among the human family as to undertake to manufacture in large quantities, as they do, this blackleg vaccine, and furnish free to the public a product that is perfectly well known in the market and that is sold universally throughout this country.

I say when the Agricultural Department has reached the stage that it has reached with reference to this article it should go out of the business and permit private enterprise to continue it, and proceed to the investigation of other questions which are not well determined. They have done this in many other instances. Why should they continue the manufacture of this article? We have in my city, as I say, a manufacturing institution that can supply the world. They commenced the manufacture of this remedy before the Agricultural Department ever thought of going into the subject, and they can furnish it to anyone who wishes it.

Mr. HEPBURN. At 15 cents a dose.

Mr. CORLISS. At 15 cents a dose; yes. Why should you in your district get blackleg vaccine for nothing and I in my district be compelled to pay the taxes for the benefit of a few citizens in your district?

Mr. HEPBURN. The Government furnishes it at the tenth part of a cent.

Mr. CORLISS. Why, there are men in my city who are engaged in this enterprise, and must depend upon this for a livelihood, and why should your farmer be supplied with the blackleg vaccine which they can manufacture? I hope and trust that this particular article will be eliminated from the bill, and that the Agricultural Department, in this instance at least, will be confined to experiments, to investigation and promulgation of knowledge, and not to competition with private enterprises in our country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, it does not make any difference whether this language remains in the bill or not. It does not matter whether the word "blackleg" is stricken out. It was simply inserted there at the request of the cattle interests of the West; but even if stricken out, the Secretary of Agriculture would go on, under the general power given him by the bill, with the experiments with vaccine for the cure of blackleg.

Mr. McRAE. You do not want it stricken out?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Oh, no; I only say that even if the House should strike it out, it would make no difference; that the Secretary would go and make his experiments. He says in his last annual report:

LOSS FROM BLACKLEG.

According to the latest report, it is estimated that the annual loss of cattle from the disease known as blackleg, or symptomatic anthrax, in the districts principally affected has ranged from 5 to 35 per cent. The Bureau of Animal Industry has been for some time distributing a vaccine for the prevention of this disease, and this, it is estimated, has reduced the loss to 0.54 per cent among the animals treated. As it is known that a large percentage of this loss was due to careless operators, it is believed that with more care in the use of the vaccine future investigations will show a still further reduction. Vaccine is still being sent out, and during the fiscal year 545,239 doses were distributed. The indications are that the contagion gradually dies out where systematic inoculations are practiced, and it was with the hope of eradicating the disease from many sections that the preparation of vaccine was undertaken.

The law gives him power to prevent the spread of pleuropneumonia and other diseases; so I say that the Secretary is still within the power given him by Congress.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Michigan will not prevail. The Secretary is making an intelligent and effective effort to stamp out this disease, which is so fatal and so destructive to large property interests. I represent a district which is perhaps as largely devoted to the raising of cattle as any represented on this floor. The people who keep cattle in my district are unanimous in demanding that the Secretary shall be allowed to continue the distribution of blackleg vaccine. The cost to the Government is trifling. The Secretary assures me that this blackleg vaccine can be manufactured for about one-tenth of a cent a dose. The vaccine manufactured by private manufacturers is found to be an inferior article.

According to the testimony of not one but dozens and hundreds of cattlemen that has been coming to me for the last three months the vaccine distributed by the Government is almost uniformly

effective, and that which is manufactured by private enterprises is almost uniformly ineffective. In my district in one of the counties largely given to the raising of cattle this blackleg has broken out to an alarming extent, and about two weeks ago the daily losses were said to be very heavy. At the request of the cattle growers of that county I induced the Secretary to send out a special supply of vaccine, and from the information that has come to me by mail and telegraph I am advised that the efforts that are being made there to stamp out the disease have met with the most satisfactory results. I hope, sir, that these cattlemen who get this little benefit from the Government will not have their right interfered with now.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLEBERG. Is it not a fact that all the stock associations in Texas and all over the West ask for this?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I was going to mention that fact. The cattle raisers' association which lately assembled at Fort Worth, which has quite a large membership from the cattle raisers of Texas, New Mexico, Colorado, Indian Territory, Oklahoma, and Arizona, passed a resolution unanimously requesting that the Secretary of Agriculture continue to exercise the right of distributing this vaccine.

Mr. STOKES. The gentleman stated a moment ago that the cost of producing this vaccine by the Department of Agriculture was about a tenth of a cent a dose.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. STOKES. Have you any information what it costs when it is purchased from private manufacturers?

Mr. SLAYDEN. From 20 to 25 cents a dose for an inferior quality. The Secretary assures me that it cost probably the tenth of a cent a dose to manufacture.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. CORLISS. If you are willing that the Agricultural Department shall manufacture an article of supply because it costs more to produce it by private enterprise, why not have the Secretary go into the oil business, and go into competition with the Standard Oil Company? I think it would be just as wise.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. CORLISS. Are you in favor of the Secretary of Agriculture going into refining oil?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the Secretary of Agriculture, as I understand it, has the right to carry on this experiment of trying to find a remedy for diseases of cattle, although in my section of country, and with the cattle of my State, so far as the effect of this remedy is concerned, it is no longer an experiment. He is now entitled to the right to continue the experiment, just as he would have the right to continue experiments with strange forage plants, and to do anything else that is for the accommodation of agriculture.

Mr. CORLISS. I would like to ask the gentleman if there is nothing more than experiment about it? Is there anything further to develop? Do you contend that there is anything further in the shape of experiment necessary to produce blackleg vaccine?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not know that there is anything necessary, and I do not know that there is anything not necessary.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Perhaps I can answer that question.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Just one moment. I want to say that I do not know that this vaccine may not be improved; but I do know this, that the Secretary of Agriculture has made improvements lately, and he tells me he believes that he has succeeded in securing a serum which will prevent hog cholera, the commercial advantage of which no gentleman in this House will undertake to estimate, and I do not want to see his intelligent and useful work interfered with.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HENRY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Michigan, I am informed by the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry that this cultivation and production of vaccine virus for blackleg is still in its experimental state. They do not regard the present product as perfection; they are still experimenting, and they desire the privilege of continuing their experiments.

Mr. CORLISS. I do not object to that. What I object to is the manufacture and distribution of it over the country to the exclusion of an article well known on the market.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know why the distribution of vaccine matter is not proper and just as a sanitary measure and why it is not a proper thing for the Government to see that diseased meat is not sold in the market. I can not see why it is not a just and proper regulation of the Government. The proper distribution of this vaccine matter unquestionably has a tendency to insure the purity of the meat. Now,

gentlemen may say that it is spoiling some business in the country. Well, it may to a limited extent.

Mr. CORLISS. Parties were manufacturing this long before the Agricultural Department commenced it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. That may be. We appoint inspectors. We have persons appointed to see that cattle that are diseased do not come into the country. We take a great many precautions against diseased meat, and it is a proper governmental regulation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. And under this very paragraph, too.

Mr. SHAFROTH. As the gentleman says, under this very paragraph. Unquestionably the tendency might be to produce an interference with the business of some manufacturer, but if we stop this disease it would make the meat better, and consequently it comes clearly within the sanitary power of the Government.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I come from a very large district of cattlemen who are deeply interested in this subject. I have numerous letters from them to the effect that the Government virus is far superior to that manufactured by the private industries referred to by the gentleman from Michigan. There is nothing that the Government can spend money for that would be of greater benefit to the people than to continue the experiments along the line that are now being conducted. The blackleg is a disease that attacks young animals, calves and yearlings, and, as has been stated, from 5 to 35 per cent of them are lost each year. Since the Agricultural Department has taken up this question they have greatly reduced the losses. I think it would be for the benefit of the entire country that this blackleg vaccine should be continued to be used and that the industry be not stifled at the present time.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to state with reference to this matter that I have had at least a thousand letters within the last ninety days concerning this very matter, and every one of the men having cattle state that they have tried the other matter furnished them by the private firms and the losses are in a great measure larger after the use of that purchased from these firms than after that which they get from the Government.

I do not believe there is a man in the West, where blackleg is prevalent, who would not sanction and urge the passage by this House of an appropriation by the Government to maintain the distribution of this vaccine matter. Of course it is hard upon some individual firms. Everything the Government does interferes, in a measure, with some kind of individual industry. But here is the distribution of a virus to prevent disease that all the people of the United States are interested in stamping out. The cattle business is asking and praying for the distribution of this virus and asking Congress that this matter may be left as it is.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I represent a great cattle State; and while I sympathize with the gentleman from Michigan, it is in line with my position on the garden-seed matter. The vaccine matter is still a matter of experiment. It is only within a year or so that it has begun to be used on the range, and the fact of the matter is that the vaccine matter sent out by the Department is not the same as that manufactured by the parties that the gentleman from Michigan speaks of. The original matter put out by these firms took two inoculations to be effective, and it only takes one of this used by the Agricultural Department. Now, when this is finally determined and is no longer an experiment, these gentlemen will get the benefit of it. The Government will introduce it so it will be popular, and then the manufacturing firms will reap the benefit.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is laboring under a misapprehension. This question I have had occasion to investigate, and I say that long before the Agricultural Department ever considered this question of manufacturing blackleg vaccine virus it was manufactured in this country by private enterprise, and I say to you that the product of private enterprise has proven to be as valuable as that manufactured by the Government.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CORLISS. I can not now; I will in a moment. In answer to my protest it was not contended that the product manufactured by private enterprise was not just as valuable and just as effective as that produced by the Secretary of Agriculture. But he did contend that the disease existed, and he said that the owners of cattle would not buy the blackleg vaccine for the purpose of eradicating the disease. I submit that this statement was not made in the right spirit. It is not the purpose of our Government to compel men to use a particular remedy; and if so, this is not the way to do it. The proper course would be to prosecute men who allow their diseased cattle to go at large.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Does the gentleman say that the product of the laboratories of these manufacturing chemists who sell this vaccine is as good as that which is made and distributed by the Government?

Mr. CORLISS. Yes, sir; and the Secretary of Agriculture does not deny it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Who is the best witness as to that—the man whose cattle get disease and die or the Secretary—

Mr. CORLISS. I can understand that if you have any cattle-men in your district—

Mr. SLAYDEN. We have a few.

Mr. CORLISS. Who want vaccine from the Government gratis, they will tell you that the product of any private enterprise is not as good.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement?

Mr. CORLISS. Certainly.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have received hundreds of letters from gentlemen of honor, repute, and veracity who say that they have tried the product of these manufacturing chemists and that the results show it is nothing like so good as that supplied by the Government.

Mr. CORLISS. The point I make is that the Government of the United States should not go into the business of supplying gratis manufactured products which are well known and which are furnished by private enterprise. The time will come when gentlemen here who speak and vote for provisions of this kind will regret it. The great mass of the people are not getting this product gratis. By its free distribution the Government is benefiting a few; but the people will find out that a few men get all the fruits of this kind of legislation; and then they will wake up to the importance of private enterprise. I ask a vote on the amendment.

The question was taken on agreeing to the amendment; and it was rejected.

Mr. CORLISS. I have another amendment. I move to amend by striking out all after the word "same," in line 13, page 31, to and including the word "exports," in line 18, page 31. The language which I propose to strike out is as follows:

And such products may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he is authorized to apply the moneys received from the sales of such products toward the continuation and repetition of such experimental exports.

Mr. Chairman, as will be observed, this little paragraph authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the open market and buy any product of this country and sell it in foreign lands, and then to take the proceeds and go on thus buying and selling. In other words, he is to go into the jobbing business, buying and selling any product of the farm or any product of our manufacturers. He is thus established in a good-sized jobbing house with a million dollars back of him. If you want to authorize such a thing as that, I am willing you should. I want to go on record against it. I have no more to say. I am ready for a vote.

Mr. WADSWORTH. One brief word of explanation. The Secretary of Agriculture has been making some experiments in regard to the manufacture of butter, cheese, and other articles for export. This is a difficult problem to deal with; and this provision authorizes him, in the prosecution of his experiments, to buy small quantities of these articles, and to dispose of them after he has no further use for them.

A MEMBER. This work that he is doing is purely experimental?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Absolutely.

Mr. CORLISS. Does the gentleman contend that the Secretary is limited in his purchases? By this paragraph you appropriate a million dollars; and under this provision he can buy, within the limits of the appropriation, any articles that he chooses.

Mr. WADSWORTH. That is a pretty broad construction.

Mr. CORLISS. The language "such products" is broad enough to include any products of the farm or the dairy; and these "may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture." There is no limit upon his discretion as to what he may purchase.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Let the gentleman read the whole provision together; not a part of it.

Mr. CORLISS. It authorizes the Secretary to go into a wholesale jobbing business.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I call the gentleman's attention to the clause immediately preceding where the products are specified. The language is:

And the Secretary of Agriculture may use so much of this sum as he deems necessary for promoting the extension and development of foreign markets for dairy and other animal products of the United States, and for suitable transportation of the same; and such products may be bought in open market and disposed of at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. CORLISS. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is no limit as to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture in this matter, or as to what he may purchase under this provision of the bill. He may buy \$500,000 worth of the products of our farms, and take the money and buy the same quantity over again. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to delay a vote upon this proposition for a single instant. But I do wish to say to the members of the committee that no practical work of the Department of Agriculture since its organization has produced more useful and beneficial results than the experimental work prosecuted by the present Secretary in the direction contemplated

by this appropriation, and no money has been more wisely expended than that which has heretofore been expended by the Department for the extension of the foreign market of our dairy products.

The proposition in the pending bill is in line with the recommendation of the Secretary himself, after careful consideration and application of the working of the system, and is in line with the experiments now in progress, which have not only been successful in themselves but have been vastly useful and beneficial to the whole dairy interest of the United States.

I do not desire to enter into a discussion of the merits of the amendment. I am only stating facts of my own knowledge. This same provision has been in the Agricultural appropriation bill for two years—last year and the preceding year.

When the Secretary of Agriculture began work under that appropriation it was found that there was not a ship carrying goods to Europe from this side of the water which had facilities to transport butter or dairy products; not only so, but nobody here knew how to pack butter for the foreign trade, and no merchant in Europe had ever seen a first-rate specimen of the article; and these are only some of the many difficulties with which the Secretary had to contend. To-day, in every market in Europe where imported butter is sold, the dairies of the United States are represented by specimens of the best creamery products of our country; ships are being equipped with refrigerating apparatus, and I repeat that no more effective service has ever been rendered to American agriculture, and especially to the dairy business of the country, than has been rendered by this experimental exportation of its products. [Applause.]

I trust the gentleman from Michigan will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Chairman, I desire the gentleman to understand that I have as high an appreciation of the value of the services rendered by the Secretary of Agriculture as any other man within the sound of my voice. I do not expect or anticipate in any way that he would take undue advantage of the law or abuse the right which is accorded to him under it, but I am opposing this proposition on general principles. I am talking of the law which you are placing on the statute books, that not only applies to the present Secretary of Agriculture but to all other Secretaries for all future time, unless the law is changed.

I believe that the present Secretary will judicially, properly, and fairly exercise this provision of the law, but do you know—have you assurances—that all Secretaries in the future will do the same thing? You are giving him the right to go into the jobbing business of buying and selling, and the next step will be to furnish him a ship to carry the products to purchasers abroad and enable him to go into that line of business on an entirely independent scale.

I submit that it is wrong in principle; it is bad practice in legislation; and I do not care whether this has been adopted in the last Congress or the Congress before. It is unwise, and we should stop it right now.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, in answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CORLISS] as to the Government going into the jobbing business, buying and selling the dairy commodities of the country abroad, it is only necessary to refer him to a fact which will completely meet his argument. The answer to his suggestion is plain and clear, that this bill gives to the Secretary of Agriculture no machinery with which to go into the jobbing business. He can not do that to any considerable extent without a clerical force, and no such force is authorized by the bill. That is a check upon the Secretary of Agriculture going into the business of jobbing. He is doing simply a limited work under a small appropriation, in an experimental business, which has resulted most beneficially in the past, and we have reason to believe that it will result beneficially in the future. It is at all events desirable to continue it for awhile and see whether it will not be of vast benefit to our people. That is all I desire to say.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings for laboratories, Department of Agriculture: For all labor, materials, heating and power apparatus, plumbing, lighting, ventilating, and other necessary expenses in erecting and fitting up suitable fireproof laboratory buildings for the use of the United States Department of Agriculture, on reservation No. 2, in the city of Washington, D. C., all plans and specifications to be approved by and the work to be done under the supervision of the Secretary of Agriculture, \$200,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that that is new legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that this is new legislation.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I admit that it is new legislation, and I suppose it will have to go out if the point of order is insisted on. I am exceedingly sorry, however, because it is simply a business proposition for the Government.

The Government is now paying \$10,000 a year rent for buildings used as laboratories, and that is 5 per cent on \$200,000. It has the land to put these buildings on, and it is a good business investment to put up the buildings called for. It is new legislation and I suppose the point of order, if insisted on, will have to be sustained.

Mr. HOPKINS. Unless the point of order was made on this bill when it was reported, it comes too late now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist on his point of order?

Mr. MAHON. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, when the point of order was under discussion on a previous paragraph, I stated that there had been a change of the general law relating to the distribution of seeds. Several gentlemen expressed a doubt upon that subject. I desire to send to the Clerk's desk, so that it may go in as a part of the debate upon the point of order, the change which was made in the law on a general appropriation bill which became a law without the approval of the President in April, 1896, in the first session of the Fifty-fourth Congress. Gentlemen will see that I was right in stating that there had been a change of the general law. I desire to say nothing further about it, except to have it go in with the debate on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to have it read? Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Simply to have it read by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That section 527 of the Revised Statutes be amended so that it will read as follows:

"SEC. 527. That purchase and distribution of vegetable, field, and flower seeds, plants, shrubs, vines, bulbs, and cuttings shall be of the freshest and best obtainable varieties and adapted to general cultivation."

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That was offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], constituting an amendment to the general law.

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman does not offer this as anything against the decision rendered by the Chair.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Not at all.

Mr. McRAE. It simply confirms the ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was aware of the statute at the time he made his ruling.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'GRADY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 10538) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments and with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the amendments will be voted upon in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WADSWORTH, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

ILLINOIS AND MISSISSIPPI CANAL.

By unanimous consent, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was discharged from the consideration of House joint resolution 225, providing for a preliminary survey and estimate for the construction of a lock in the dam across Rock River, at the head of the feeder for the Illinois and Mississippi Canal; and the same was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

And then, on motion of Mr. WADSWORTH (at 4 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement of the receipts, expenditures, and estimated surplus in the Treasury—to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the case of the brig *Chio*, R. M. Ball, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the conclusions of fact and law in the case of the schooner *Polly*, Benjamin Shillaber, master, against the United States—to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from

the Chief of Engineers relating to certain disallowances of the mileage accounts of Maj. E. H. Ruffner—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a report of the Supervising Inspector-General of the Steamboat-Inspection Service on bill H. R. 9925—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed (all except bill).

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting report of the Supervising Inspector-General of the Steamboat-Inspection Service on bill H. R. 10154—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed (all except bill).

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Surgeon-General of the Army, with the draft of a bill for establishing the status of acting hospital stewards—to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9825) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all just claims against the United States for private property taken and used in the military service within the limits of the United States during the war with Spain, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 980); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SPALDING, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 66) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain claims of the State of Indiana, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 981); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2938) to create a board of health and to regulate the practice of medicine and surgery in the Indian Territory, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 984); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10590) to set apart a preserve for the American bison, and for other purposes, reported the same in lieu of H. R. 6062, accompanied by a report (No. 985); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PAYNE, from the Committee on Ways and Means, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8245) to temporarily provide revenue for the relief of the island of Porto Rico, and for other purposes, reported the same with Senate amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 986); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5296) establishing terms of the United States circuit court at Newbern and Elizabeth City, N. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 987); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10210) granting a pension to Ellen Miles Brown, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 959); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8404) to increase pension of Timothy A. Lewis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 960); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8157) granting an increase of pension to T. C. Mills, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 961); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HEDGE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Mrs. Louise Adams, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 962); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1748) for the relief of Mrs. Ellen V. McCleery, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 963); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9915) granting a pension to Madison T. Trent, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 964); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1570) granting a pension to Susie Margarine Landrum, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 965); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3252) for the relief of Sarah Somerville Lion, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 966); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6564) granting a pension to Anna M. Starr, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 967); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4118) granting an increase of pension to Enos H. Kirk, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 968); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to Levi G. Wilgus, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 969); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to Zylpha J. Kelley, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 970); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3082) granting a pension to J. H. Sparks, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 971); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2632) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Baylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 972); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7588) granting a pension to Robert Patterson, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 973); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3983) for the relief of the Merchants and Miners' Transportation Company, of Baltimore, Md., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 974); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7887) for the relief of B. F. Moody & Co. or their legal representatives, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 975); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SIMS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5428) for the relief of John M. B. Walker, administrator of the estate of James Walker, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 976); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6339) for the relief of Thomas Stack, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 977); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDWELL, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9727) for the relief of St. John's Hospital, of Springfield, Ill., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 978); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HENRY of Mississippi, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 1136) for the relief of parties for property taken from them by military forces of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 979); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. ROBB, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2311) for the relief of Mrs. Ella M. Shell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 982); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, Mr. ROBB, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7705) for the relief of Langhorne D. Lewis, reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 983); which said bill and report were ordered to lie on the table.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 329) for the relief of John E. Welch, a citizen of the United States—Committee on Appropriations discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 7012) to increase the pension of Emma C. Stevenson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10564) granting an increase of pension to James R. Husted—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10584) to grant an honorable discharge to Jacob Hahn, of the Navy—Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 10586) providing for the erection of a public building in the city of Charlottesville, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 10587) to prevent the placing of signs "For sale" or "For rent" upon private property in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 10588) for the erection of a monument or memorial building at the scene of the Lochry massacre near the mouth of Laughery Creek, Indiana—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10589) to amend section 12 of an act entitled "An act to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues," approved June 10, 1890—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY, from the Committee on the Public Lands: A bill (H. R. 10590) to set apart a preserve for the American bison, and for other purposes—to the Union Calendar.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: A bill (H. R. 10591) to amend section 2 of the act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 10592) to further protect the first day of the week as a day of rest in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CALDWELL (by request): A bill (H. R. 10593) granting pensions to teamsters of the war of the rebellion and Indian wars from 1861 to 1865, inclusive—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 231) for preliminary examination and survey of Manitowoc Harbor, Wisconsin, with a view of making a harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: A resolution (H. Res. 223) authorizing the Sergeant-at-Arms to purchase an emergency case of medicine and suitable instruments for minor operations, for use in case of illness or accident to persons in attendance at the House—to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: A bill (H. R. 10594)

granting an increase of pension to John M. Bickford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 10595) for the relief of Francis J. Smith, late of Maury County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 10596) to correct the military record of John Fagin—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10597) to correct the military record of Walter S. Mulford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10598) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John R. Edwards—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10599) increasing the pension of George Lambert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 10600) to remove the charge of desertion standing against the military record of Frank Hamner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GAMBLE: A bill (H. R. 10601) granting a pension to Eber Robbins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 10602) granting an increase of pension to William H. Whipple, of North Dana, Mass., late private, Company B, Twenty-seventh Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10603) granting an increase of pension to Erastus E. Edmunds, late private, Company H, Fifty-first Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 10604) for the relief of James S. Fruit, collector of internal revenue at Pittsburg, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 10605) granting a pension to Henry H. Sarver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10606) granting a pension to George Kegrice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 10607) granting increase of pension to Nathan Disbrow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10608) granting an increase of pension to John M. Seydel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 10609) granting an increase of pension to John S. Randlett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 10610) for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Sarah A. Gayle, deceased, late of Amite County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MADDOX: A bill (H. R. 10611) for relief of estate of Charles Coulter—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10612) granting an increase of pension to Richard Hardin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 10613) to correct the military record of H. Lofland—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10614) for the relief of Nettie B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPIGHT: A bill (H. R. 10615) for the relief of Mrs. Matilda Jones, administratrix of Abraham Jones, deceased, late of Union County, Miss.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 10616) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan Mead—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10617) granting an increase of pension to Kate E. Duffy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10618) granting an increase of pension to Martin O'Connor—to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BABCOCK: Petition of Allen McVay Post, No. 154, of Lafarge, Wis., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Lena M. Clarson and others, of Fennimore and vicinity, Wisconsin, against the sale of intoxicants in the Army, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of the St. Louis Merchants' Exchange, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of D. B. Huston and others, of Butler County, Ohio, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURTON: Petition of Memorial Post, No. 141, Grand

Army of the Republic, Department of Ohio, indorsing the bill for service pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER (by request): Petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the Baptist, Methodist Episcopal, Presbyterian, and United Presbyterian churches of Oxford; Nottingham Monthly Meeting of Friends, Chester County, and the Prospect Christian Endeavor Society, of Moore, Delaware County, Pa., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: Petition of Hobart Post, No. 411, Grand Army of the Republic, of Hobart, Ind., in relation to amending Senate bill No. 1477, in regard to pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of citizens of Georgetown, S. C., for public building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EMERSON: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Frank Hamner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Plattsburg, Schuylers Falls, Burke, and Wright, N. Y., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FINLEY (by request): Petition of N. C. Lane, for and on behalf of certain other contractors and business men in the District of Columbia, in the matter of advertising for proposals for public works—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES: Resolutions of Holston Division, No. 239, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, in favor of House bill No. 8021, to restrict the sale of convict-made goods to the State or Territory in which they are manufactured—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Petition of Thomas Vandervelde and other citizens of Big Stone City, S. Dak.; W. Roby and others, of Parker, S. Dak., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Chicago Federation of Labor and the Columbus (Ohio) Trades and Labor Assembly, against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Petition of Grange No. 1107, Patrons of Husbandry, of Hamilton Township, Jackson County, Ind., in support of House bill No. 3717, to control the sale of imitation dairy products; also in favor of Senate bill 1439, to vest additional authority in the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill to grant a pension to Henry H. Sarver—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, statement of facts to accompany bill for the erection of monument to the memory of Colonel Lochry and other soldiers massacred by the Indians July 24, 1778—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petitions of T. P. Jones and W. G. Larimore, of Union Station, Ohio, in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of union gospel temperance meetings held in the Baptist and Methodist churches in Seymour, Ind., to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens and at military posts—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Petitions of citizens of Richmond, Elgin, and Richardson, Ill., favoring the Grout bill relating to dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of the Christian Endeavor Society, of Marengo, Ill., and citizens of Rockfalls, Ill., to prohibit the selling of liquors in any post exchange, transport, or premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACK: Petition of W. F. Barkley and others, of Ebenezer, Pa., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Resolution of D. S. Cowles Post, No. 540, W. H. Appleby, commander, James Brant, adjutant, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Lewis J. Henry and other citizens of La Grange, N. Y., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LANE: Petition of Silas Jackson Post, No. 255, of West Liberty, Department of Iowa, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LITTAUER: Petition of Canby Post, No. 17, of Gloversville, N. Y., Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of a bill locating a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: Petition of Christian Endeavor Society of Daretown, N. J., for the passage of a bill to forbid liquor selling in canteens and in the Army, Navy, and Soldiers' Homes—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. MCALEER: Petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Columbus, Ohio, against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of the Quaker City Rubber Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring provision for irrigation of arid lands—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of Local Union No. 8, of Philadelphia, Pa., United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, asking that some of the battle ships be built in the Government navy-yards—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the Central News Company and J. B. Lippincott Company, of Philadelphia, Pa., in opposition to the passage of House bill No. 10275, as being detrimental to the publishing interests of the country—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Hardware Association, favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums, etc.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of E. L. Rogers & Co. and others, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Samuel B. Woods, president of the Virginia State Horticultural Society, Charlottesville, Va., approving House bill No. 8246, known as the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McDOWELL: Petition of Frys Valley Grange, No. 1136, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Frys Valley Grange, No. 1136, in favor of House bill No. 3717, relating to dairy products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of labor associations of Newark, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 4911, to increase the pay of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petition of Noah Moser and other citizens of Loogootee, Ind., against the passage of House bill No. 8754, placing a tax on process butter—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of the Thirty-fourth Annual Encampment of the Department of Massachusetts, Grand Army of the Republic, to have February 12 made a national holiday in honor of the birthday of Abraham Lincoln—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of D. J. Driscoll and other druggists of Boston, Mass., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORTON of Ohio: Petition of John Fangboner and 26 others, of Fremont; John Wren and others, of Deunquat, and Jacob Wetz and others, of Wharton, Ohio, in favor of Senate bill 1439, to vest additional authority in the Interstate Commerce Commission—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Rev. Faris Brown and 20 others, of Tiro, Ohio, favoring the passage of House bill No. 9151, to regulate the sale of liquor in the Philippine Islands—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, petition of Modern Woodmen's Society of Gallion, Ohio, and W. E. Shephard and others, of Huron, Ohio, in favor of an amendment to the Loud bill so as to admit fraternal papers at second-class rates—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of churches of Wolcott, N. Y., to prevent the dealing in intoxicating drinks upon premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of Margaret J. Beall, administratrix, with affidavits, praying reference of war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Petitions of Tracy Post, of Apalachin; Banks Post, of Greene, and England Post, of Delhi, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of New York, favoring the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Grange No. 788, Patrons of Husbandry, New York, for State control of imitation dairy products as provided in House bill No. 3717—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana: Petition of William C. Vollmer, L. C. Griffith, and R. K. Miller, of Fort Wayne, Ind., favoring the passage of the Grout bill, No. 1051, relating to grading of substitute letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Papers to accompany House bill for the relief of Nettie B. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of members of Curran Circle, No. 17, of Utica,

N. Y., urging the enactment of House bill 5457, known as the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of Ballard Post, No. 551, of Taberg; Leyden Station Post; Skillen Post, Rome; Star Post, Lee Center, Department of New York, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of House bill No. 7094, to establish a Branch Soldiers' Home at Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petitions of citizens of Millers Mills Grange, citizens of Oriskany, and citizens of Lee, N. Y., to amend the present law in relation to the sale of oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Clinton Grange and Millers Mills Grange, New York, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of fourth-class postmasters of Crawford County, Pa., praying for the passage of the Cummings bill increasing the compensation of postmasters of the fourth-class post-offices—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: Petitions of George Hall, George H. Chappell, Douglass D. Cook, and others, in the State of Michigan, for amendment to the homestead laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPALDING: Resolutions of the Congregational Church of Oriska, N. Dak., for the passage of the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of A. Fetter and others, of Ypsilanti, N. Dak., against the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Fred Steingrueber and others, of Hebron, N. Dak., favoring the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SPIGHT: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Abraham Jones—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of J. L. Riker Post, No. 62, Grand Army of the Republic, of New York City, in favor of House bill No. 7094, for the establishment of a Branch Soldiers' Home near Johnson City, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Iowa: Papers to accompany House bill No. 2617, for the relief of the legal representatives of Edwin De Leon, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 5872, for the relief of the Pittsburg, Shenango and Lake Erie Railroad Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, petitions of the Methodist Episcopal Church, Presbyterian Church, and Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Battle Creek, Iowa, to prohibit the sale of liquor on premises owned or used by the Government—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEEKS (by request): Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Memphis, Mich., to prevent the selling of intoxicating drinks upon premises used for military purposes, etc.—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petitions of Thomas Stephenson and citizens of Marlette, Carsonville, and Applegate, Mich., and of the National Hay Association, in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Petition of Parish Post, No. 265, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring an amendment to the pension laws—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, April 11, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. BURROWS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, without objection.

JORGE CRUZ.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 7th instant, a statement of the action of the Department in the case of Jorge Cruz, a resident of Porto Rico, alleged to have been brought to New York under contract to labor in the United States, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, and ordered to be printed.

AGES OF EMPLOYEES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 16th ultimo, a statement showing

the ages and number of clerks, messengers, etc., in the Department, and also the number of those who are incapacitated either physically or mentally for manual labor, etc.; which, with the accompanying paper, was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7433) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. LITTLE managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2864) to create a commission to make settlement and adjustment with the Sioux City and Pacific Railroad Company of its indebtedness to the Government of the United States; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of Street and Building Laborers' Union No. 7405, American Federation of Labor, of Rochester, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pay of the male laborers in the Government Printing Office; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

He also presented a petition of West Groton Grange, No. 818, Patrons of Husbandry, of West Groton, N. Y., and a petition of the Christian Endeavor Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Potsdam, N. Y., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors on any premises or grounds used for military purposes by the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Canaan Grange, No. 821, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, and a petition of Millers Mills Grange, No. 581, Patrons of Husbandry, of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to secure to the people of the country the advantages of State control of imitation dairy products; which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of A. C. Wilson, of Fairfield; of Millers Mills Grange, No. 581, Patrons of Husbandry, and of Canaan Grange, No. 821, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation granting additional powers to the Interstate Commerce Commission; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PENROSE presented a petition of the Hardware Association of Philadelphia, Pa., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of 51 citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a memorial of the Medical Society of Crawford County, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation for the further prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army Association of Allegheny County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to establish the Fredericksburg and Adjacent Battlefields Memorial Park in the State of Virginia, and also that an appropriation be made for the construction of an Army and Navy General Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange, No. 19, Patrons of Husbandry, of Wyoming County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation taxing oleomargarine 10 cents per pound when it is colored in imitation of butter; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Baptist Young People's Union, the Epworth League, and the Presbyterian Young People's Society of Christian Endeavor, all of Tunkhannock, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in our new island possessions; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. McMILLAN presented petitions of the congregation of the Swedish Methodist Episcopal Church of Ishpeming, the Young People's Society of Ishpeming, and the congregation of the Baptist Church of Ishpeming, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors by the Government to members of the Army and Navy of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.